

“My Father’s Name”: The Significance and Impetus of the Divine Name in the Fourth Gospel

Joshua J. F. Coutts

Doctor of Philosophy in New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology
University of Edinburgh
2016

Abstract

One of the distinctive features of the Fourth Gospel is the emphasis placed on the divine name (ὄνομα). The name occurs eight times (5.43; 10.25; 12.13, 28; 17.6, 11-12, 26), in key passages and in striking expressions such as “I have made known your name” (17.6) and “your name, which you gave me” (17.11). This thesis uses historical-critical methodology in a close reading of the Fourth Gospel to determine why John is so attracted to the name category. It is argued that, for John, the divine name was fundamentally an eschatological category with a built-in duality or “associative” significance, which he derives primarily from his reading of Isaiah.

It is plausible that Isaiah was the primary impetus for John’s interest in the divine name, because name language is bound up with the “I am” expression and glory language in Isaiah—both of which more clearly underlie John’s “I am” sayings and glory motif. Furthermore, the significance of the name in Isaiah as the object of eschatological expectation (Isa 52.6), and as a concept by which God is associated with his Servant, attracted John to the name category as ideal for his nuanced presentation of Jesus.

In John’s use of the name category, it is possible to distinguish the question of significance from that of referent, meaning, and function. This, in turn, facilitates a clear evaluation of possible catalysts for John’s name concept. It is demonstrated that a variety of Jewish and Christian background influences contributed to John’s name concept at the level of referent, meaning, and function. However, the eschatological and associative significance of the name in the Fourth Gospel is particularly indebted to the name concept in Isaiah.

This is significant, in part, because Isaiah places such emphasis on the exclusivity of God. It may be that a zeal for God’s exclusivity had generated accusations against the community of believers known to John, that, by their allegiance to Jesus, they were guilty of blaspheming the name in particular. The name was, perhaps, a “flashpoint” for the community, and the text of Isaiah a key battle-ground for defining fidelity to God, and the identity of the people of God. By associating Jesus with the divine name, John legitimates the allegiance of believers to Jesus in the face of Jewish opposition, as well as comforts those who were troubled by the continued absence of Jesus, with the point that they were yet identified by the divine name (17.11), and that eschatological revelation of the name promised in Isaiah was extended to their own time as well (17.26b).

Lay Summary

One of the distinctive features of the Fourth Gospel is the emphasis placed on the “name” of God. There are eight occurrences of “name” in reference to God the Father (John 5.43; 10.25; 12.13, 28; 17.6, 11-12, 26), some of which are in key passages and in striking expressions such as in Jesus’ claim to have revealed God’s name (17.6) and to have been given the name (17.11). This indicates that the divine name was an important concept for the author of the Fourth Gospel (“John”). This thesis features a close reading of the Fourth Gospel in the context of many other ancient Jewish and Christian texts to determine why John is so attracted to the whole idea of the divine name at all.

It is argued that, for John, the concept of God’s name was at the heart of the self-revelation and saving action that God had promised his people, and was also a concept by which God could be associated with a distinguishable figure. Moreover, John derived both of these aspects of the name concept primarily from his reading of certain passages in Isaiah 40-66. A discussion of name language in the Fourth Gospel can be sub-divided into four parts: the actual name in view (i.e., referent), the meaning, and function of name language in context, and the significance of the name concept. Although various background influences have informed John’s name concept at the level of referent, meaning, and function, the significance of the name is indebted particularly to the name concept in Isaiah. It is possible that first century believers with whom John was familiar had been accused by their fellow Jews of blaspheming the divine name because of their allegiance to Jesus. Thus by drawing on the authoritative text of Isaiah to present Jesus in terms of the divine name, John legitimates the allegiance of believers to Jesus in the face of opposition, and comforts those who may have been troubled by Jesus’ absence with the thought that they were still party to the self-revelation and saving action God had promised his people. Thus, John’s emphasis on the divine name opens up a window into how he understood both Jesus and the community of believers who placed their faith in him.

I, Joshua J. F. Coutts, hereby certify that this thesis has been written by me, is the record of work conducted by me, and has not been submitted for any other degree.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Acknowledgements

I have been surrounded by a community of people who have enriched, supported, and upheld me through my years of study, the culmination of which is represented to some degree by this thesis. I am grateful to the faculty at New College, from whom I have learned a great deal, and in particular, my doctoral supervisors, Professor Larry Hurtado and Professor Paul Foster, whose timely and insightful feedback has contributed substantially to the improvement of the project. I have also gleaned much from the kind and deeply knowledgeable members of the John group at BNTC over the past four years. Likewise, the insightful feedback and rich conversations with members of the annual Seminar on the NT use of the OT has been a great delight. I am grateful in particular to Susan Docherty, Steve Moyise, Darrell Hannah, Andrew Lincoln, Peter Doble, David Allen, and especially to Wendy North—who has been so generous with her time, wisdom, insight, and encouragement. I am furthermore grateful for the careful attention which my examiners, Dr. Catrin Williams and Professor Helen Bond, devoted to this work, and for their very helpful suggestions.

I was first inspired to study the Gospels more deeply by Carl Hinderager and Wes Olmstead, who modeled for me a rich combination of scholarship, humility, and grace. And there are few from whom I have learned more than Rikk Watts, who has been a constant source of inspiration and encouragement for me over the years.

Many others have poured into me over the years—too many to name here. However, I am particularly grateful to the pastors at Central in Brantford, who gave me space to explore a vocation in teaching Scripture. I also wish to thank John Stackhouse, whose counsel is always wise, and Don Lewis, who has been a kind and faithful friend for many years. I am thankful to Mariam Kovalyshin, who encouraged me in my first steps applying for doctoral programs. I am thankful for the long-standing friendship of Aaron Smith and Aaron Pluim. Old friends are precious for their rarity. And a special thanks goes to Murray and Janet Bradshaw—two of the most beautiful people I have had the privilege to know, and without whose encouragement and support, I could not have undertaken this project. My thanks goes also to the board members of the Institute for Religion and Culture, who enabled me to finish well.

A Ph.D. is a long lonely road, and I could not have made it through without a strong community undergirding me in Edinburgh. I am thankful for my colleagues at New College, with whom I have enjoyed many chats over coffee, or rounds of squash—Andrew Kelley, Samuel Hildebrandt, Kengo Akiyama, Will Kelly, Zack Cole, Ray Lozano, Brad Penner, Eric Beck, David Robinson, Mark Batluck, Taylor Ince, Luke Wisley, Frank Dicken, Sean Adams, Seth Ehorn, Brendon Witte, and Kurtis Peters. And the last two years would not have been nearly as enjoyable without the good friendship of Tom Breimaier. My Fridays would have been downright dull, if not for the good company of Graeme McClelland. And I am also deeply thankful for the community I have enjoyed at Chalmers Church. I am thankful for the men in my Cord group and for the rich friendship of George Craig, Ben Wiffen, Ben Beaumont, Ian Clausen, and Phil Reimer. I am especially thankful for the tireless support, care, and encouragement of Robin Sydserff, and of Sam Orr, who has become like a brother. I wish especially to thank Mary for the gift of her joy, kindness, and companionship for the journey.

No one has invested in me quite as much as my parents, Bob and Alison Coutts. I owe them an immeasurable debt for their constancy, faithfulness, love, and tireless support and encouragement in every venture to which I put my hand. This work is dedicated to them. Finally, I owe the greatest debt of all to Jesus Christ, who has condescended to let me bear his name, and through whom, I have come to know the Name of the One in whom I am kept.

For Mom and Dad

Contents

Introduction	1
A. The divine Name in GJohn	1
B. History of Research	5
1. “God” in GJohn	5
2. The divine Name in the New Testament	6
3. Studies on the divine Name in GJohn	9
a) Background Studies	9
b) Studies of ὄνομα within GJohn	13
C. The Present Study	16
1. Contribution and Outline of the Present Study	16
2. Method	19
3. Aspects of the Divine Name Concept	20
a) Names in Greco-Roman Tradition	21
b) Names and the divine Name in Jewish Tradition	22
c) The “Significance” of the Name in GJohn	24
Part 1	
Chapter 1: The Significance of Isaiah for John’s Divine Name Concept	27
A. Isaiah in GJohn	27
B. Isaiah’s “I am” and “Glory” in GJohn	34
C. Divine Name Cluster in Isaiah	37
1. The divine Name and “I am” sayings in Isaiah	37
2. The divine Name and Glory in Isaiah	39
a) Polemical and Eschatological Significance	40
b) Associative Significance	42
i. Name, Glory, and Arm	43
ii. Glory as Associative	45
iii. Name as Associative	47
a. LXX	47
b. Qumran	51
c. <i>Songs of David</i>	52
d. 1 Enoch	53
e. Christian Texts	57
D. Isaiah’s Name Cluster in GJohn	60
E. Conclusion	63
Part 2: Exegesis of Divine Name Expressions in GJohn	65
Chapter 2: Name Glorification and Revelation	67
A. John 12.28	67
1. Function	67
2. Meaning	68
3. Significance	71

B. John 17.6, 26a	71
1. Function	72
2. Meaning	77
3. Significance	81
a) Associative	81
b) Eschatological	82
C. John 17.26b	83
1. Function	84
2. Meaning	89
3. Significance	90
4. Summary	91
D. Impetus	92
1. Early Christian Tradition	92
a) διαγγέλλω/ἀπαγγέλλω	92
b) Synoptics	93
c) <i>Didache</i>	96
2. Name Angel Traditions	97
a) Personified “Name”	98
b) <i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	99
c) <i>1 Enoch</i>	100
3. Targumic Tradition	102
4. Mystical and Magical Traditions	103
a) Mystical Traditions	103
b) Magical Texts	105
c) <i>Corpus Hermeticum</i>	106
d) <i>Gospel of Truth</i>	106
5. Exodus Tradition	108
6. Isaiah	110
a) General Correspondence	111
b) Name-Revelation in Isaiah and John 4.26	112
c) Isaiah 52—53 in John 12	115
E. Conclusion	116
 Chapter 3: Kept in the Shared Name	 119
A. Introduction	119
B. John 17.11-12: Name-Giving	120
1. Meaning	120
2. Function	121
C. John 17.11-12: Kept in the Name	125
1. Meaning	125
2. Function	130
D. Significance	132
1. Associative	132
2. Eschatological	134
E. Impetus	136
1. Graeco-Roman Adoption	137

2. Early Christian Tradition	140
a) In the Father's Name	140
b) Name-Giving	142
c) Revelation	144
3. Various Jewish and Christian Magical and Mystical Traditions	145
a) Name-Sealing	145
b) <i>Odes of Solomon</i>	146
c) <i>Nag Hammadi</i> Texts	148
4. Name Angel Traditions	149
a) <i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	149
b) <i>1 Enoch</i>	150
c) Philo	151
d) <i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>	151
e) <i>Prayer of Joseph</i>	153
f) <i>Memar Marqah</i>	154
g) Angelomorphic Priesthood	155
5. OT Naming Tradition	157
6. Isaiah	160
F. Conclusion	163
 Chapter 4: "In my Father's Name"	 165
A. Introduction	165
B. John 5.43	165
1. Meaning	167
2. Function	169
3. Significance	170
C. John 10.25	173
1. Meaning	174
2. Function	175
3. Significance	176
D. Impetus	179
1. Synoptic Tradition	180
2. Agency Tradition	181
3. Isaiah	183
E. Conclusion	185
 Conclusion	 187
A. Thesis Summary	187
B. Thesis Implications	189
1. Sociological Impetus	189
2. The Present Work in Relation to Johannine Theology	196
3. Avenues for Further Research	197
 Abbreviations	 199
Bibliography	201

Introduction

The Divine Name in GJohn

Historically, treatments of the theology of the Gospel of John (hereafter “GJohn”) have emphasized John’s¹ use of titles (e.g., Word and Son), the distinctive “I am” statements, the sending or descent/ascent motifs, or Jesus’ role as “revealer.” However, one aspect of the Gospel, which has been largely neglected, is the emphasis on the divine Name.² Most scholars pass over references to the Father’s *ὄνομα* as a simple circumlocution for God himself.³ However, the explosion of Name language, in diverse and striking statements, and at key points in the narrative, suggests that John regarded the category as significant. An extended study on the divine Name in GJohn is merited by (i) the variety of statements in which the Name occurs, (ii) the striking use of the divine Name in contrast to other NT texts, and (iii) the significant role of Name statements within the structure of GJohn.

First, John’s usage of the Name is diverse. Of the twenty-five uses of *ὄνομα* in GJohn, twelve refer to Jesus’ name, and eight to the Father’s Name (divine Name) (5.43; 10.25; 12.13; 12.28; 17.6, 11-12, 26).⁴ These eight references to the divine Name are deployed in a variety of expressions and for a range of functions: expressions of agency, which function to authorize Jesus (5.43; 10.25; cf. 12.13); a cultic expression, “Father, glorify your Name” (12.28), and revelatory expressions (17.6, 26), which identify Jesus’ mission with the revelation of God’s Name; a giving expression (17.11-12) which functions to authorize and legitimate Jesus; and the phrase “Keep them in your Name,” in

¹ For ease of discussion, in the present work, I will refer to the Fourth Gospel as “GJohn” and to its author as “John.” In doing so, I make no judgment about the authorship of GJohn.

² I will use the designation “divine Name” or occasionally “Name” (capitalized) throughout this thesis to refer to the use of *ὄνομα* when it is with reference to the Father, or the closely related covenant Name יהוה/κύριος. See n. 32, 108.

³ E.g., “glorify your name” means “glorify yourself.” Bultmann, 428; Moloney, 353; Barrett, 425; Lindars, 431. And revealing the Name (17.6, 26) means “the disclosure of God himself.” Bultmann, 498; Moloney, 462; Schnackenburg, III: 175; Brown, II: 743; Adelheid Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name Gottes und der Name Jesu: Eine neutestamentliche Studie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1999), 211-212. Note that for ease of citation, commentaries on GJohn will be referenced simply by the commentator’s surname, and where necessary, volume number. See Commentaries listed in Bibliography for full information.

⁴ *ὄνομα* is used in reference to Jesus’ name in 1.12; 2.23; 3.18; 14.13-14, 26; 15.16, 21; 16.23-24, 26; 20.31. Five remaining instances of *ὄνομα* referring to human figures are unimportant for the present investigation (1.6; 3.1; 5.43; 10.3; 18.10).

which the Name identifies Jesus' followers.⁵ As the Name occurs in this variety of contexts, it is likely that the Name was a fundamental category for John, as Franz Untergassmair puts it: "Insgesamt stellt man also eine Variabilität von Formen, Verbindungen und sprachlichen Formulierungen mit ὄνομα fest, die Joh aber sämtlich für seine Theologie benutzt."⁶

Second, John develops the early Christian presentation of Jesus in terms of the divine Name, deploying references to the Name more extensively than any other NT author. Of course, it is not straightforward to isolate all the occurrences of ὄνομα that refer to the Father in the NT, since there is something of a sliding scale between the divine Name and Jesus' Name:

- (i) "name" meaning *Jesus* (e.g., Mk 6.14)
- (ii) Jesus' "name" functioning christologically (e.g., in baptism or exorcism; Matt 7.22; Acts 2.38)
- (iii) Jesus' name functioning as the divine Name would in Jewish tradition (e.g., as the means of salvation in Acts 4.12, or locus of belief in Acts 3.16)
- (iv) Ambiguous name expressions, the form of which suggests the divine Name, but the referent of which is Jesus' name, such as the use of "the name of the Lord"⁷
- (v) Ambiguous expressions, which refer primarily to the divine Name, but in the context include reference to Jesus in some way
- (vi) Straightforward references to the divine Name, in which the Father alone is in view

Our interest lies primarily with the latter two of these categories, in which the primary referent of "name" is the Father, and implicitly then the Name in question is the divine Name. To be sure, one might quibble over whether an individual occurrence of ὄνομα is an instance of iv, v, or vi.⁸

⁵ All biblical translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated. Text of the Greek New Testament is taken from NA²⁸, except where a variant is favoured, as will be noted.

⁶ Franz G. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu, der Namensbegriff im Johannesevangelium: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den johanneischen Namensaussagen* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974), 185. Here he speaks also of references to Jesus' name.

⁷ The parallel between "the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 8.16; 19.5, 13, 17; 21.13; 1 Cor 1.2; 5.4; 6.11; Col 3.17) and "the name of the Lord" (Acts 2.21; 9.28; 22.16; Rom 10.13; 2 Tim 2.19; Jas 5.10, 14) suggests that both expressions share Jesus as referent. C. J. Davis argues this point at length. Carl Judson Davis, *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 122-140. Similarly suffering for or because of Jesus' name (John 15.21; Acts 15.26; 21.13) encourages readers to regard Jesus as the implied referent of the phrase "for the name" (Acts 5.41; Rom 1.5; 3 John 7).

⁸ E.g., James 2.7 and Hebrews 13.15 might refer to *Jesus'* name (iv) or to the divine Name with reference to Jesus (v).

However, it is striking to note that, whereas roughly 30% (68 of 231) of occurrences of *ὄνομα* in the NT are Johannine, this figure rises to nearly half (14 of 32) when we isolate NT occurrences of the divine Name (categories v and vi).⁹ In particular, GJohn, which constitutes only 11% of the NT, contains 25% of all NT occurrences of the divine Name. When we eliminate occurrences of the Name within a citation,¹⁰ this figure rises above 33% (7 of 20). The following chart indicates all the passages in which reference is made to the divine Name, categorized by the expressions in which it occurs:¹¹

Divine Name Phrase/Expression	Johannine	Revelation	Synoptics & Acts	Undisputed Paulines	General/Pastoral
Coming in the Name	John 5.43, [12.13]		[Mk 11.9]; [Matt 21.9]; [Matt 23.39]; [Lk 13.35]; [Lk 19.38]		
Works/Words in the Name	John 10.25				Jas 5.10
glorify/praise/hallow/fear the Name	John 12.28	Rev 11.18; 15.4	Matt 6.9; Lk 11.2	[Rom 15.9]	
Reveal/proclaim the Name	John 17.6, 26			[Rom 9.17]	[Heb 2.12]
Kept, sealed, inscribed, called in/by the Name	John 17.11-12	Rev 3.12; 14.1	[Acts 15.17]		
Baptized in the Name			Matt 28.19		
Give/inherit the Name	John 17.11-12			Phil 2.9 (cf. Eph 1.23)	Heb 1.4?
BlaspHEME the Name		Rev 13.6; 16.9		[Rom 2.24]	1 Tim 6.1
For/because of the Name			Acts 15.14		

This chart is intended only to highlight the explosion of divine Name occurrences in GJohn relative to the New Testament. Although there is superficial similarity of expression shared

⁹ Paul (Rom 2.24; 9.17; 15.9; Phil 2.9 [cf. Eph 1.21]); Other (Jas 5.10; Heb 1.4?; 2.12; 1 Tim 6.1); Synoptics/Acts (Mk 11.9; Matt 6.9; 21.9; 23.39; 28.19; Lk 11.2; 13.35; 19.38; Acts 15.14, 17); Johannine (John 5.43; 10.25; 12.13, 28; 17.6, 11-12, 26; Rev 3.12; 11.18; 13.6; 14.1; 15.4; 16.9). Occasionally, the referent is ambiguous. Romans 1.5 may refer to the divine Name, especially in light of the interest in the divine Name elsewhere in Romans (Rom 2.24; 9.17; 15.9). However, since the previous pronoun clearly refers back to the son, it is most natural to read "*his* name" here with the same referent. The NIV translation makes this most explicit, while others reflect the ambiguity of the Greek (e.g., NRSV, NKJV, HCSB). Although slightly unclear, in view of the flow of statements in Hebrews 13.12-16, the referent of the name in Hebrews 13.15 is most likely Jesus, not the divine Name. Thus these texts are not included in the discussion here.

¹⁰ John 12.13; Rom 2.24; 9.17; 15.9; Heb 2.12; Mk 11.9; Matt 21.9; 23.39; Lk 13.35; 19.38.

¹¹ Name expressions occurring within an OT citation are placed in square brackets [].

between GJohn and other NT passages, discussion in the chapters that follow will reveal additional ways in which John has developed and extended the category for his own distinctive use. One observation may be instructive at this point, however: Of only three distinct expressions in which the divine Name occurs in the Synoptic tradition, John appears to have seized upon and reformulated two: “in the name of the Lord” (Mk 11.9 +para.) may have generated the Johannine “in my Father’s name” (5.43; cf. 10.25); and the prayer tradition “hallowed be your Name” (Matt 6.9; Lk 11.2) may underlie John’s “glorify your Name” (12.28).¹² All this suggests that the divine Name was more constitutive of John’s thinking than that of the other NT authors.

Third, John has deployed the divine Name at climactic points in his narrative. Jesus’ public ministry (chs 2—12), characterized by signs and polemical discourses, climaxes with the arrival of Jesus’ anticipated hour¹³ in John 12.23. At the heart of this “hour” stands the inextricably linked glorification of both the Son and the divine Name (12.23; 28; cf. 13.31-32; 17.1). The significance of the moment is punctuated further by the Father’s own surprising entrance into the narrative,¹⁴ which focuses on the divine Name: “I have glorified [my Name] and I will glorify [it] again” (12.28). As if this were not enough, as Jesus reflects back upon the mission which culminates in the arrival of this “hour” (17.1), he summarizes his entire mission of revelation in the expression “I have made known your name” (17.6), his mission of preserving believers (6.39) in terms of the divine Name: “I have kept them in your Name” (17.12), and perhaps also his exalted but dependent relationship with the Father in terms of being given the Name (17.11).

The distinctive emphasis on the divine Name, as reflected in the variety of expressions in which it occurs, in distinction from other NT authors, and at climactic points in the narrative raises an important question which will govern the current project: *Why has John seized upon and so emphasized the divine Name category beyond that which occurs in earlier Christian tradition? What is it about the divine Name that attracted his attention?*

¹² The only other divine Name expression in the Synoptic tradition occurs in Matthew, which may not have been known to John: “baptizing them in the Name of the Father...” (Matt 28.19).

¹³ John 2.4; 7.30; 8.20; cf. 4.21, 23; 5.25, 28; 16.2, 21, 25, 32.

¹⁴ The theophanic voice stands out in a Gospel in which the Father is not seen directly (1.18; 14.8-9), epithets or descriptive adjectives for God are strikingly absent, and (as Thompson points out) he is characterized primarily as the one who is known in Jesus. Marianne Meye Thompson, “‘God’s Voice You Have Never Heard, God’s Form You Have Never Seen’: The Characterization of God in the Gospel of John,” *Semeia* 63 (1993): 188.

History of Research

As John is particularly synthetic in his thought, a survey of all studies that impinge on our topic is impossible. Nevertheless, I will endeavour to sketch a map of the work within which the current project is situated, beginning with the broader discourses of “God” in GJohn and of the divine “Name” in the New Testament, and concluding with a survey of those studies which highlight the divine Name in GJohn.

“God” in GJohn

In one sense, the divine Name in GJohn could be considered a sub-category within the broader question of “God” in the New Testament, which Nils Dahl once referred to as the “neglected factor in New Testament theology.”¹⁵ In 1982, C. K. Barrett asked if the christological interpretation of GJohn had gone “too far” in Johannine scholarship.¹⁶ And Tord Larsson noted a relative disinterest in the question of God within recent Johannine scholarship.¹⁷

Nevertheless, although Jesus remains central to John’s understanding of God in recent scholarship, attention is increasingly paid to the explicitly *theological* framework of the Gospel: “He has made the *Father* known” (1.18). Barrett himself suggested John is writing ultimately about God.¹⁸ In his study of “Father” language in GJohn, Paul Meyer noted that both Christology and theology concern primarily the relationship of God to Jesus and thus cannot be collapsed into each other.¹⁹ More recently, Christiane Zimmermann, in her tome, *Die Namen des Vaters*, has proposed that the traditional Jewish designation for God as Father is given a focus in Jesus, being established through the pre-existence of the Son,²⁰ and, as τέχνα θεοῦ, the believing community is

¹⁵ Nils A. Dahl, “The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology,” *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*, ed. Donald H. Juel (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 153-163.

¹⁶ C. K. Barrett, “Christocentric or Theocentric? Observations on the Theological Method of the Fourth Gospel,” in *Essays on John* (London: SPCK, 1982), 2.

¹⁷ Tord Larsson, *God in the Fourth Gospel: A Hermeneutical Study of the History of Interpretations* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 223.

¹⁸ Ibid., 3. Also C. K. Barrett, “The Father Is Greater Than I’ (John 14.28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament,” in *Essays on John* (London: SPCK, 1982), 34.

¹⁹ Paul W. Meyer, “The Father’: The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: Essays in Honour of D. Moody-Smith*, ed. Clifton C. Black and R. A. Culpepper (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 255-273. Richardson speaks similarly of the “inseparability of Father and Son” in GJohn. Neil Richardson, *God in the New Testament* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1999), 25, 37.

²⁰ Christiane Zimmermann, *Die Namen des Vaters: Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen vor ihrem frühjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 116-117.

defined in terms of the Father.²¹ Larry Hurtado argues that God retains “the overarching and crucial place” in GJohn,²² as Jesus prays to God, his actions are derivative from God and for God, and he is revered out of obedience to God.²³ Consequently, “God” is redefined with reference to Jesus.²⁴

Narrative readings of GJohn produce similar conclusions. Francis Moloney suggests that GJohn is fundamentally “narrative theology,” designed to tell the how “God has entered history in and through the person of Jesus.”²⁵ D. F. Tolmie argues that the characterization of God is achieved primarily with reference to Jesus, but reaches a climax when the Fatherhood of God is extended to believers in 20.17.²⁶ In his study of the characterization of both the Father and Son, Daniel Sadananda concludes that John sought to keep the Christology of his community “within the most revered monotheistic framework.”²⁷ And in a series of studies,²⁸ Marianne Thompson argues that Jesus’ identity is articulated solely with reference to the Father, and conversely that the Father is characterized primarily through the words and deeds of Jesus.²⁹

The Divine Name in the New Testament

Although the scholarship on the divine Name in Second Temple Judaism is extensive,³⁰ treatments of the divine Name category within the NT reflect the “neglect” suffered by the study

²¹ Ibid., 124-125.

²² Larry Hurtado, *God in New Testament Theology* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2010), 53.

²³ Ibid., 55-65.

²⁴ Ibid., 69.

²⁵ Francis J. Moloney, “Telling God’s Story: The Fourth Gospel,” in *Forgotten God: Perspectives in Biblical Theology*, ed. A. Andrew Das and Frank J. Matera (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 108.

²⁶ D. Francois Tolmie, “The Characterization of God in the Fourth Gospel,” *JSNT* 69 (1998): 57-75.

²⁷ Daniel R. Sadananda, *The Johannine Exegesis of God: An Exploration into the Johannine Understanding of God* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 286.

²⁸ Thompson, “God’s Voice,” 177-204. Idem., *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000), 133-154. Idem., *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001).

²⁹ Ibid., 51.

³⁰ Fossum investigates Jewish and Samaritan traditions in which intermediary figures are identified with the divine Name. Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985). Several studies survey later rabbinic understandings of the divine Name. Notably, Hayward argues that the *Memra* in the Targums represents God’s self-designation ܡܝܪܬܐ and signifies divine presence. C. T. R. Hayward,

of “God” Dahl noted, in that they have tended to focus on the implications of the divine Name concept for Christology.³¹ This takes two major inter-related forms. First, studies abound on the early Christian application of the title ὁ κύριος (the substitute for YHWH in citations and allusions to OT passages³²) to Jesus. In his seminal work, *Kyrios Christos*, Wilhelm Bousset argued that designations of Jesus as “Lord” first emerged in Gentile Christian circles, due to pagan influence.³³ However, subsequent studies have emphasized the Semitic background of the title, and the role played by christological exegesis of OT passages in designating Jesus as “Lord.”³⁴

Second, a parallel dialogue was generated by Heitmüller’s classic study, which located the NT use of *Jesus’* name in the context of Jewish and pagan “Namenphilosophie.” He argued that in the Jewish conception, the Name was an “Art Hypostase...ein Doppelgänger Gottes,”³⁵ which

Divine Name and Presence: The Memra (Totowa: Allanheld, Osmun and Co., 1981). See also Samuel S. Cohon, “The Name of God: A Study in Rabbinic Theology,” *HUCA* 23 (1950): 579-604. G. H. Park-Taylor, *Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975), 79-89. Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (Boston: Brill, 2002), 159-205. Nils A. Dahl and Alan F. Segal, “Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God,” *JSJ* 9 (1978): 1-28. For the divine Name in Jewish mystical and Gnostic traditions, see Robert J. Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God: From the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 155-172, 185-196.

³¹ Several even suggest that the OT significance of the divine Name YHWH is attached in the NT to the name “Jesus.” E.g., Oskar Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im alten Testament* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1934), 183. Cf. Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans., John E. Steely (New York: Abingdon Press, 1970), 293. Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 75) thought the Name revealed in Exodus 3 was “Jesus.”

³² Note however that the Tetragrammaton was rendered in some circles alternately by Ιάω (perhaps the earliest convention), Hebrew square script, paleo-Hebrew script, θεός, blank spaces, dots/dashes, and ΠΙΠΙ, as well as ὁ κύριος. Also the latter may have been used in some instances as a replacement for and not a translation of the Tetragrammaton. For an excellent discussion of issues and data surrounding the exact relationship between ὁ κύριος and YHWH, see Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton*, 50-88. He argues that ὁ κύριος may well have occurred for YHWH in Greek manuscripts by the Christian period, but there is no concrete evidence for this. Rösel argues similarly. Martin Rösel, “The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch,” *JSOT* 31 (2007): 412-425.

³³ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, esp. 119-148.

³⁴ Significant examples include Richard Bauckham, “God Crucified,” in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament’s Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 1-59. Davis, *Name and Way*; David B. Capes, “YHWH Texts and Monotheism in Paul’s Christology,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 120-137. Larry Hurtado adds to this an emphasis on early Christian religious experience as a key impetus behind reverence for Jesus as “Lord.” Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003).

³⁵ Wilhelm Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu: Eine sprach-und religionsgeschichtlich Untersuchung zum neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristliche Taufe* (Göttingen: Vanderhoek & Ruprecht, 1903), 154-155. Similar

participated in divine power to protect or to heal.³⁶ This was combined with pagan practices involving numinous and apotropaic names to form the “Hintergrund” for the role played by Jesus’ name in early Christian practice.³⁷ Jean Daniélou provided a comprehensive survey of early Christian texts in which he argued that the name “Jesus” was regarded as a divine Name, and in which ὁ ὄνομα was used as a designation for Jesus.³⁸ Other studies of Jesus’ name could be multiplied.³⁹

One notable exception to these Christologically-focused studies is Adelheid Ruck-Schröder’s *Der Name Gottes und der Name Jesu*, in which she analyses expressions containing ὄνομα throughout the NT, devoting equal attention to those pertaining to God and to Jesus.⁴⁰ Less interested in background influences, she focuses on the rhetorical *function* of name language to identify believers.

Also noteworthy for Johannine studies is research conducted on the expansion on the divine Name reflected in Revelation 1.4: ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾔς καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Martin McNamara argues that the seer drew upon the Targums on Exodus 3.14 and Deuteronomy 32.39.⁴¹ More recently,

arguments were advanced by Giesbrecht, whose study was restricted to the OT, but helped to frame Heitmüller’s work (see Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 153, n.5). Friedrich Giesbrecht, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage* (Königsberg: Thomas & Oppermann, 1901). See also, Grether, *Name und Wort*, 3. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, trans., D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), 183.

³⁶ Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 138-142.

³⁷ Ibid., 252-257. Benno Jacob, by contrast, laid greater stress on the Hellenistic influence. Benno Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes: Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtlich Untersuchung zum alten und neuen Testament* (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903), 49; also 110-115.

³⁸ Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. and ed. by J. A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964), 147-163. For similar brief treatments, see Richard Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (London: SCM, 1970), 41-46. Aloys Grillmeier, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*, vol. 1 of *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 2d rev. ed., trans. John Bowden (Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975), 41-43. See also Larry W. Hurtado, “Jesus’ as God’s Name, and Jesus as God’s embodied Name in Justin Martyr,” in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 128-136. Also see n.31.

³⁹ E.g., Silva New, “The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands,” in *The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, part 1, vol. 5 of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan & Co., 1933), 121-139. Lars Hartman, *‘Into the Name of the Lord Jesus’: Baptism in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997). William Q. Parkinson, “In the Name of Jesus: The Ritual Use and Christological Significance of the Name of Jesus in Early Christianity” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2003).

⁴⁰ Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*.

⁴¹ Martin McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 97-117.

Sean McDonough has argued that the Tetragrammaton both evoked the God of Israel's past, and was central to their identity in a Hellenistic world.⁴² Revelation 1.4 is a statement over-against pagan claims for Zeus or the world, but also represents the influence of Isaiah 44.6 and an expansion upon Exodus 3.14.

Studies on the Divine Name in GJohn

Because *ὄνομα* occurs with reference to the Father far more in GJohn than any other individual NT document, it has received slightly more attention here than elsewhere in the NT. Studies which entail the divine Name in GJohn may be roughly divided into two groups—those that investigate the conceptual background of John's name language and studies which analyse name language within GJohn itself. In what follows, I will survey these studies before assessing them briefly in a discussion of the current project.

a) Background Studies

Scholars who have sought to identify the influence(s) or background to John's divine Name concept may be divided into three general camps.⁴³ First are those who have emphasized the influence of a hypostatic Jewish Name concept. Gilles Quispel was one of the first to observe what he regarded as interesting parallels between Jewish and Gnostic traditions of the divine Name and GJohn.⁴⁴ His work influenced Jean Daniélou, who speculated that the divine Name category may even undergird John's *Logos* concept: "Is it not possible that the expression: 'The Word...dwelt among us' may be based on an older form: 'The Name...dwelt among us'?"⁴⁵ Based on a comparative study of Jewish, Samaritan, and Gnostic traditions, Jarl Fossum argued similarly that *ὁ ὄνομα* was a hypostasis, virtually interchangeable with the "angel of Lord," which thus could

⁴² Sean M. McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos: Rev 1.4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

⁴³ By "influences," I mean sources upon which John drew for his Name concept, and by "background," I mean more general currents of thought which illuminate how John understands the concept.

⁴⁴ Gilles Quispel, "Het Johannesevangelie en de Gnosis" (1957), 173-203. Idem, "Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity," in *John and Qumran*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972), 149-155.

⁴⁵ Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 150, n.15. Cf. Quispel, "Qumran, John, and Jewish Christianity," 150.

tabernacle among humanity (e.g., Pss. Sol. 7.6) and was instrumental in creation.⁴⁶ Moreover, in Jewish tradition, it is explicitly paired with the *Logos*, which came to replace it in Hellenistic Jewish traditions. Echoing Quispel, Fossum suggested that John's *Logos* is merely a "cryptograph" for Name.⁴⁷ More recently, his student, Charles Gieschen, has expanded on these ideas in a broader argument for the angelomorphic foundations of NT Christology.⁴⁸

A second group argues for a targumic background to John's divine Name concept. There has been much speculation over the possible relationship between the targumic *Memra* (particularly in Neofiti) and the Johannine *Logos*.⁴⁹ Such a link is more easily established by those who regard the *Memra* as a hypostasis, and not a mere circumlocution for the Tetragrammaton.⁵⁰ However, C. T. R. Hayward argues that both the Johannine *Logos* and the targumic *Memra* essentially have to do with the exposition of the divine Name: On the one hand, *Memra* is an exegetical term for the designation "I will be" (Exod 3.14). On the other hand, John 1.14-18 alludes to the Name-exposition of Exodus 34 and identifies Jesus as the embodiment of God's "Name." From this observation, Hayward infers that GJohn reflects "*Memra*-theology,"⁵¹ and "depicts Jesus as the *Memra*, who is God's Name...."⁵² In a 2010 monograph, John Ronning builds on this idea by proposing that the meaning of Exodus 3.14 is expounded in Tg. Ps.-J. Deuteronomy 32.39 in terms of the *Memra*: "When the Word [*Memra*] of the Lord is revealed...he will say...'I am he who is and was and I am he who will be in the future'." Ronning suggests that John regarded Jesus as the *Memra*, whose "I am" sayings continue where the divine self-expression "I am he" in the OT left

⁴⁶ Jarl E. Fossum, "In the Beginning was the Name: Onomanology as the Key to Johannine Christology," in *The Image of the Invisible God: The Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 117-133. This essay applies to GJohn the fruit of his research in Fossum, *Name of God*. See *ibid.*, 255-256, n.32.

⁴⁷ Fossum, "Onomanology," 117.

⁴⁸ Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). He places greater emphasis on the Name Angel of Exodus 23.20-21, around which various traditions arose in the Second Temple period. In particular, angelic figures were described as bearing the Name, and "Name" itself (alongside other divine categories such as "Word," "Glory," "Wisdom," and "Power") came to be distinguished from God as personal entities. See *ibid.*, 70-123.

⁴⁹ See C. T. R. Hayward, "The Holy Name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St. John's Gospel," *NTS* 25 (1978): 16-21.

⁵⁰ E.g., Daniel Boyarin, "The Gospel of the *Memra*: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *HTR* 94 (2001): 243-284. He argues that John 1.1-13 represents Jewish midrash on Genesis 1 featuring the pre-existent *Memra*. The Christian innovation occurs with the incarnation in verse 14.

⁵¹ Hayward, "The Holy Name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St. John's Gospel," 27.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 30.

off, and whose mission as the *Logos* is to expound the divine Name (John 17.6).⁵³ Interestingly, Tsouterov has made a parallel argument, only without the emphasis on targumic influence. He argues that the description of Jesus as full of “grace and truth” alludes to Exodus 34.5-6, where God proclaims his own Name, and that this accounts for Jesus’ claim in 17.6: “I have made known your Name.”⁵⁴

A final group has suggested that the text of Isaiah is a significant background for John’s divine Name concept. Franklin W. Young first drew attention to the possibility of a relationship between GJohn and the Name concept in Isaiah in 1955, when he noted, both that Isaiah was regarded as the prophet *par excellence* in John’s day, and that John’s use of name language parallels certain passages in Isaiah.⁵⁵ However, since Young, discussions of this possible relationship have been few and brief, although many scholars note the possibility of a link in passing.⁵⁶ Larry Hurtado has given the matter more attention, suggesting that a christological reading of certain passages in Isaiah facilitated John’s presentation of Jesus in terms of the divine Name and divine glory.⁵⁷ John adopts the traditional category of the Name in order to legitimate claims made about Jesus’ glorification, and ultimately to make claims about Jesus himself.⁵⁸

In addition, given the potential relationship between “Name” and “Lord,” it is worth noting Riemer Roukema’s recent essay arguing that, for John, Jesus is ὁ κύριος or “YHWH.” Since Jesus is distinguished from the Father, Roukema suggests that John had read the OT, and particularly Isaiah, as making reference to two distinguishable figures—“God” and “YHWH/Lord.” Since “God” is never seen, theophanic visions in the OT are of YHWH, whom John identifies with Jesus. Following Ball and Williams, he notes that Jesus is the one identified by the Isaianic

⁵³ John L. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John’s Logos Theology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010). In an earlier essay, he also pointed out various Johannine passages referring to Jesus’ name, which may allude to OT texts, the Targums of which mention the divine “Name”: John 1.12 and Tg. Neof. Num 14.11; John 3.18 and Tg. Ps.-J. Num 21.8-9; 1 John 2.12-13 and Tg. Isa. 43.25; 3 John 7 and Tg. Isa. 48.11. John L. Ronning, “The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature,” *WTJ* 69 (2007): 247-278.

⁵⁴ Alexandr Tsouterov, “Glory, Grace, and Truth in the Gospel of John 1.14-18” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2005).

⁵⁵ Franklin W. Young, “A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel,” *ZNW* 46 (1955): 224-226.

⁵⁶ Most commonly Isaiah 52.6 is mentioned in discussions of John 17.6. Schnackenburg, III: 175; Barrett, 505; Carson, 558. Evans interestingly links the same passage to the theophanic voice of John 12.28. Craig A. Evans, “The Voice from Heaven: A Note on John 12.28,” *CBQ* 43 (1981): 408.

⁵⁷ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 378-389.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 382, 387-389.

expression “I am,” and following Andrew Brunson, he suggests that Jesus’ approach to Jerusalem in John 12 actualizes the return of YHWH. This Christology, he suggests, underlies Jesus’ claim to have “made known your Name” (17.6). Moreover, it reflects a tendency among John’s contemporaries to disassociate God from a distinguishable figure—the *Logos* in Wisdom 18.14-15 and Philo, κύριος in Justin Martyr, and the *Memra* in the Targums.⁵⁹

Similarly, since some scholars identify the divine Name in GJohn as “I am,”⁶⁰ it is relevant to note that there is now a near consensus that John’s “I am” sayings derive primarily from Isaiah 40-55 (hereafter “Deutero-Isaiah”).⁶¹ This has been argued persuasively by David Ball, who uses narrative criticism to determine the function of the “I am” statements in their contexts as the means of identifying their primary background.⁶² Since the Johannine “I am” sayings share the same function as the “I am he” sayings in Deutero-Isaiah, he concludes that John consciously used Isaiah as a source for his “I am” language and its accompanying ideology. More recently, Catrin Williams has strengthened this case by tracing the reception history of the Isaianic *אני הוה* formula through to the rabbinic period.⁶³ She contends that it is a distinct expression, not to be conflated with the “I am” of Exodus 3, and that it undoubtedly underlies John’s “I am” statements.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Riemer Roukema, “Jesus and the Divine Name in the Gospel of John,” in *Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*, ed. George H. van Kooten (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 219-221.

⁶⁰ E.g., Brown, II: 756. Also Kerr, who thereby includes a discussion of the “I am” sayings in his argument that Jesus embodies the presence of God as the Temple. Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 323-345. I am less confident of this identification. Catrin Williams argues persuasively that the Isaianic *אני הוה*, from which John’s “I am” is derived, is distinguishable from the divine Name in terms of function, although readers of the LXX translation of Isaiah may have regarded it as a divine Name of sorts. Catrin H. Williams, *I Am He: The Interpretation of ‘Anî Hû’ in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 40-41, 279-283, 304, 307. Nevertheless, the “Name” and “I am” certainly occupy a parallel conceptual space in GJohn.

⁶¹ This is in contrast to earlier emphases on Greek or Mandaean influence. E.g., Bultmann, 225-226; Barrett, 292. Note that throughout the present work, I use the designation “Deutero-Isaiah” as a short-hand reference to Isaiah 40-55. In so doing, I make no judgment on the editorial process by which Isaiah was produced. Furthermore, I am not here suggesting that John was aware of any such scholarly divisions in the text. He would have regarded Isaiah as a single, unified work.

⁶² David Mark Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), esp. 177-203.

⁶³ Williams, *I Am He*, esp. 255-303.

⁶⁴ Ibid. See similarly C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge University Press, 1968), 95-96; Brown, I: 535-537; J. Richter, “Ani Hu und Ego Eimi,” (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Erlangen, 1956); Gunther Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 166-173. H. Zimmermann, “Das Absolute ‘Ego Eimi’ als die

b) Studies of ὄνομα within GJohn

A second group of studies focuses on the name statements in their context in an effort to identify the meaning or function of name language in GJohn. In 1934, Octave Merlier sought to determine the meaning of “in/into the name” expressions (whether that of the Father or Son) in GJohn and in the Johannine epistles.⁶⁵ Since, in the LXX, ὄνομα modified by a possessive pronoun simply denotes the person referred to, he argued that “your name” in John 12.28, 17.6, 26 similarly means simply “you”: “Suivis d’un pronom personnel-possessif, μου, σου, αὐτοῦ, ils forment avec lui une sorte de pronom renforcé: το ὄνομά μου, c’est ma personne = moi-même.”⁶⁶ When understood in relation to its attendant verb, the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι means “from the Father” (with ἔρχομαι) or “by means of the Father” (with ποιέω).⁶⁷

In his unpublished 1972 dissertation,⁶⁸ James McPolin explores the relationship between the divine Name and Jesus’ name in GJohn. In contrast to Merlier, he argues that ὄνομα is not merely synonymous with God or Jesus, but denotes the person *as revealed*.⁶⁹ In the context of Father-Son language, the “Name” is a correlative concept. So, in 17.11, the Name *given* is “Father,” and the name *received* is “Son.” The Name-revelation (17.6) means that God is revealed as “Father” of Jesus and his disciples. Correspondingly, Jesus’ name denotes his capacity as “Son,” and belief in his name is thus “the most comprehensive expression of Johannine faith” because it denotes Jesus “under that aspect by which he is the source and exemplar of our sonship.”⁷⁰

neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformel,” *BZ* 4 (1960): 54-69; A. Feuillet, “Les Ego Eimi Christologiques du Quatrième Evangile: La Révélation Énigmatique de l’être Divine de Jésus dans Jean et les Synoptiques,” *RSR* 54 (1966): 11-12; Philip B. Harner, *The “I Am” of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), 37-48. For a dissenting view, see Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 82-87. And Daube suggests a rabbinic background for the predicative sayings. David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone, 1956), 325-329. See also Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 72-73.

⁶⁵ Octave Merlier, “‘Onoma’ et ‘en Onomati’ dans le Quatrième Évangile,” *REG* 47 (1934): 180-204.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 185; cf. pp. 186-187.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁶⁸ James McPolin, “The ‘Name’ of the Father and of the Son in the Johannine Writings: An Exegetical Study of the Johannine Texts on *Onoma* with Reference to the Father and the Son” (Ph.D. Thesis, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972).

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 52. Bietenhard seems to take a similar view: “Jesus makes this name manifest, certain and plain, so that it again acquires specific content: Father.” Hans Bietenhard, “‘Ὄνομα’ in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. V (E-IIa), ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967), 272.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 49-50.

Two years later, Franz Untergassmair investigated the meaning of John's name language (both the Father's and Jesus') in his *Im Namen Jesu*.⁷¹ Although he seems unaware of McPolin's work, Untergassmair makes a roughly similar point that the divine Name *means* the Father in his self-revelation, and the name of the Son refers to the disclosure of the work, which is completed in the cross.⁷² Believing in Jesus' name means believing in him as sent from God and as the legitimate revealer of God.⁷³ Yet, whereas for McPolin, John's name language is circumscribed by the Father-Son relationship, Untergassmair suggests that name language gives voice to the basic theological statement of GJohn, i.e., the revelation of the Father through the Son: "Im ὄνομα des Sohnes wird...das ὄνομα des Vaters transparent."⁷⁴ The fundamental meaning of the various name-statements in GJohn is structured and informed by John's theology of revelation:

[ὄνομα] ist ein formaler Begriff, der im jeweiligen Zusammenhange theologische Relevanz gewinnt. Innerhalb des vierten Ev hat er eine ihm gezielt zugewiesene Funktion: Nicht *den*, sondern einen Modus unter anderen zu figurieren, nach welchem das Joh-Ev seinen Lesern das Ereignis der Selbstmitteilung Gottes in der Person und im Wirken seines Offenbarers Jesus Christus und dessen Bedeutung für das Heil des Menschen zugänglich machen will.⁷⁵

Untergassmair could equally have been included amongst those investigating the background to John's Name concept, since he ends his study with a comparison of John's Name concept to other literature, including the OT, the *Gospel of Truth* and the *Odes of Solomon*. Although he finds some similarities, the differences diminish the value of these texts for accounting for John's distinctive usage. He concludes that the role of name language within John's revelation theology is his own unique innovation.⁷⁶

In contrast to these broader studies, G. Franklin Shirbourn focuses on the statement in John 17.11-12: "the name *which you gave me*."⁷⁷ His interest lies in the significance of the expression as a whole, and thus he draws together analyses of both *giving* and *name* language in GJohn. He argues that, because it is the divine Name, the Name-giving expression distinguishes Jesus from

⁷¹ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*.

⁷² Ibid., 152.

⁷³ Ibid., 172, 174.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 181.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 187.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 364.

⁷⁷ G. F. Shirbourn, "The Giving of the Name of God to Jesus in John 17.11, 12" (Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1985).

lesser agents (e.g., Moses) as the pre-existent Son, establishes his oneness with the Father, and divinely authorizes him and his mission. However, the fact that the Name is given lays stress on Jesus' dependence on the Father, and consequently, the claim made for him is not blasphemous.⁷⁸ Shirbourn suggests further that the climactic placement of this Name-giving—both in chapter 17, and as the climax of all that the Father gives the Son (including life, authority/judgment, words, and disciples)—signals the significance of 17.11-12 for John's theology: “the suitability of the *onoma*-[C]hristology as an epitome of the relationship between the Father and the Son is suggested by its appearance in the prayer of Jesus which may be taken as an epitome of the Fourth Gospel itself.”⁷⁹

Three brief treatments should also be included in this discussion. In a brief survey of all occurrences of “name” in GJohn, Von Grégoire Rouiller suggests that the various divine Name expressions in GJohn signal a relationship between God and his Son or his people.⁸⁰ In a brief, but finely nuanced essay, Andrew Lincoln suggests that prayer in Jesus' name is the means by which believers participate in Jesus' mission of revealing the divine Name.⁸¹ And, in her brief treatment of GJohn, Ruck-Schröder follows Untergassmair in his insistence on situating the Name-concept within John's revelatory theology.⁸² However, she advances the discussion by proposing that the revelation of the divine Name through Jesus functioned to identify John's community, and that the explosion of name statements in GJohn should be understood as the solution to the challenge posed by the time after Jesus' departure. Because of Jesus' unity with the Father, his own name becomes the reference point of faith, prayer and suffering, and characterizes the life and identity of the community—the “children of God.”⁸³ Moreover, as the reference point of faith, and the name in which the Spirit is sent, Jesus' name signals, not only revelation, but also the ongoing presence of Jesus in the community.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 176.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 286.

⁸⁰ Von Grégoire Rouiller, “Leben in seinem Namen: Der Evangelist Johannes und seine Theologie des Namens,” *IKZ* 22 (1993): 54-62.

⁸¹ Andrew T. Lincoln, “God's Name, Jesus' Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, ed. Richard Longenecker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001), 155-180. See similarly Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 211-213.

⁸² Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 203-219.

⁸³ Ibid., 213.

The Present Study

Contribution and Outline of the Present Study

It is striking how little overlap there is between studies identifying the background to John's divine Name concept, and those which investigate the meaning of name language within the Gospel. Untergassmair's treatment of name language in GJohn is one of the most helpful, in part because he attends both to the text of GJohn and potential background influences. This point alone can account for some of the weaknesses in much of the research hitherto undertaken. Proponents of a hypostatic Name background tend to rely too heavily on external parallels to explain what is occurring within GJohn, with little attention to GJohn itself. Fossum, for instance, draws on traditions featuring a personified "Name" and points to a perceived interchangeability between "Name" and "Word" in John 17 to propose that, for John, Jesus is "the Name of God."⁸⁴ But such simplistic equations are not supported by the text, which is better expounded in the more nuanced studies of McPolin and Untergassmair. Ronning similarly gives little attention to how the Name functions within GJohn in his attempt to defend John's indebtedness to targumic tradition. Moreover, he conflates distinct expressions such as YHWH, "I will be who I will be," "I am he," and "I am," and bases arguments for GJohn on inferences drawn from the epistles or Revelation. In addition, the arguments of both Fossum and Ronning are vulnerable to the same methodological critique that the Samaritan and targumic texts, upon which they draw in their proposals, postdate GJohn, thereby diminishing their value in accounting for John's Name concept.

Conversely, close textual readings by McPolin and Shirbroun may suffer from inattention to the Second Temple background to John's Name concept. McPolin's argument that "name" means "Father" and "Son," for instance, does not consider whether these titles function elsewhere as names. And Shirbroun's study of the Name-giving may have benefitted from attending to Jewish traditions in which principal agents are similarly endowed with the divine Name.

In addition to these weaknesses, within each of these two fields of inquiry, questions remain. First, the variety of proposals for the background of John's Name concept lends credence to Menken's astute observation:

⁸⁴ Fossum, "Onomanology," esp. 126-127. Similarly, Charles Gieschen, "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 246.

Johannine research of the last century has shown very clearly that the question of the religious background for the Fourth Gospel cannot be solved by one single, simple answer. The evangelist has been influenced in various ways and it is his independent, creative incorporation of those influences into a new synthesis, which makes it so difficult to determine them exactly.⁸⁵

Perhaps, then, arguments for a singular or exclusive background to John's divine Name concept—whether scriptural, angelomorphic, gnostic, or targumic—are unwarranted. A way must be found instead of accommodating a variety of backgrounds.

Second, studies on the meaning of John's name language have rightly located it in the context of the Gospel: Most consider the divine Name alongside Jesus' name, Untergassmair embeds Name language in John's revelatory theology, and Shirbourn develops the Name concept alongside John's "giving" motif. Nevertheless, little effort has been made to locate the divine Name concept in the context of what are arguably the closest parallel concepts in GJohn: the "I am" expressions and glory motif.⁸⁶

The present study will endeavour to address some of these issues by responding to the question of *impetus* raised earlier: *Why has John seized upon and so emphasized the Name concept from earlier Jewish and Christian tradition?* Such a study should take account, not only of the constraints imposed by the traditions which inform our text, but also the generative impulse out of which John's distinctive emphasis on the divine Name emerged.⁸⁷ As will be demonstrated in the chapters that follow, it is likely that John drew upon a number of sources or influences for his Name concept; these influences contributed to and are reflected in the meaning and function of ὄνομα in its various contexts. However, of special interest for the current thesis is the particular influence which made the Name category itself significant for John, and therefore desirable for christological appropriation. I will refer to this hereafter as the primary "catalyst" or "impetus" for John's interest in the divine Name category. To put this another way, the meaning and function of

⁸⁵ Maarten J. J. Menken, "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 299.

⁸⁶ Untergassmair merely notes the potential here in a parenthetical comment which he does not develop: "Es gibt im Joh-Ev auch andere Ausdrücke, die etwa in dieser Richtung das Vater und Sohn Gemeinsame bezeichnen, so z.B. vor allem die ζωή, die δόξα." Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 181.

⁸⁷ In her brief treatment of GJohn, Ruck-Schröder had asked similarly *why* GJohn features such an explosion of name-statements. Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 205. However, her focus on John's rhetorical purposes, and not in the catalyst(s) for his initial attraction to the Name category.

ὄνομα within GJohn reflects a variety of influences; however the particular significance accorded the divine Name in GJohn reflects the primary impetus for John's interest in the category.

The question of impetus, thus, nuances the question of background influence which may allow better for the synthesis of various influences. In addition, identifying the impetus for John's interest in the divine Name will require attending to the significance of the Name within the Gospel itself, and in relation to close parallel concepts. Thus in answering the question of impetus, this project will also attempt to avoid the weaknesses inherent in the two fields of inquiry outlined above. The study will qualify Young's suggestion that John was influenced by Isaiah's name language by arguing instead that John was indebted to Isaiah for his *interest* in the divine Name, while allowing for other background influences. Furthermore, it will draw attention to the significance of the divine Name category for John's Christology, while locating Johannine Christology within a theological framework.

My argument is that in the GJohn, divine Name traditions are drawn upon in a distinctive way to present Jesus as the eschatological manifestation of the divine Name, as expressed particularly in the latter half of Isaiah. John is drawn to the divine Name category because of its eschatological significance, particularly in Isaiah; and he is enabled to do so by what may be designated the "associative" significance of the divine Name in Isaiah. By "associative," I mean that divine Name language had a built-in duality, evoking both God and a distinguishable figure with whom God was associated. And by "eschatological," I mean the idea that the disclosure of the divine Name was a historical event—future from Isaiah's perspective, but both realized and future from John's perspective. In the event of Jesus (i.e., his actions, words, life, death, and resurrection) the anticipated revelation of the Name had occurred, and would continue to occur in the future. Since the Name is eschatological and associative for John, he deploys this language to comfort believers that, in Jesus, they have access to God himself, and their allegiance to him is justified. Conversely, the rejection of Jesus amounts to a defamation of the divine Name itself, and a rejection of the eschatological action of God in history.

The study will be divided into two main parts: In the first part (chapter 1), I will make the case that God's eschatological self-manifestation of the divine Name as reflected particularly (although not exclusively) in the text of Isaiah generated John's interest in and use of the divine Name category. In part two, I will turn to the text of GJohn to analyse the statements in which the divine Name occurs: Statements of Name-glorification and Name-revelation (12.28; 17.6, 26) (chapter 2), keeping believers in the shared Name (17.11-12) (chapter 3), and agency expressions of

Jesus coming in or acting in the Name (5.43; 10.25; 12.13) (chapter 4). In each of these chapters, I will endeavour to identify the significance of the Name within these expressions, which in turn, may be used to distinguish the variety of background influences from the primary impetus behind John's interest in the divine Name concept. Finally, in a conclusion, I will explore possible sociological—both polemical and pastoral—impetuses for John's interest in the Name, as well as the implications of this study for John's theology.

Method

This study will be governed by three main methodological considerations. First, this study endeavours to engage in a close reading of the text of GJohn. Although attention should be paid to the complex factors involved in the composition of the Gospel, the question of this study is not greatly affected by focusing on the compositional history of the Gospel, or the question of its relation to the historical Jesus. It may well be, for instance, that John 17, which contains most of the occurrences of *ὄνομα* referring to the Father within the Gospel, is a later addition to GJohn. If this is the case, then the question of impetus for "John's" interest in the divine Name category could be applied more specifically to this editor or editorial layer, but the conclusions drawn would be largely the same. Thus the focus of this study will be on the Greek text of GJohn as we have it. The divine Name statements in GJohn will be discussed in relation to their immediate context, and the context of the Gospel as a whole.

Second, every effort must be made to interpret GJohn in a way which does most justice to his own writing style and conceptual world. John is fond of the overlap and interplay between concepts, and even within concepts. Wayne Meeks noted correctly that John's "[C]hristology is expressed through the interrelationship of the titles and above all by the total structure of the gospel."⁸⁸ The divine Name cannot be understood apart from the conceptual network in which it functions in GJohn. Notable is the interplay between Name and glory language in GJohn. Jesus both reveals and glorifies the divine Name; he receives glory and Name from the Father; the divine Name is glorified while Jesus' name is invoked; believers are given to see divine glory, and to know the divine Name and that "I am." Also, Name expressions must be read in context of one another. So, Jesus' claim to come in "my Father's name" is reminiscent of the crowd's acclamation of the one who comes "in the name of the Lord," and his claim "I have made your name known

⁸⁸ Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 19.

and I will make it known,” echoes the Father’s statement, “I have glorified [my Name] and I will glorify it again.” Although it is the distinctions that constitute much of the grist for scholarly mills, it is both distinction *and* interplay which interests John.

Third, as has been demonstrated in countless studies, especially since the discoveries of the scrolls in the Judean desert, GJohn is a profoundly Jewish work, and John is intentionally dialoguing with the traditions of Israel. Thus Jewish traditions, and particularly the OT, have significant bearing on his divine Name concept. For the comparison of GJohn with other texts, several considerations apply.

- (i) The interest of this study is solely in how John and his contemporaries would have read or deployed biblical language and concepts, not modern OT scholars.
- (ii) Room must be left for John’s own distinctive re-working of traditions. This means that, in comparing GJohn with contemporaneous texts and with OT passages, attention must be paid not only to similarities between texts and concepts, but also to differences.⁸⁹
- (iii) Any parallels drawn with other texts must take account of their dating and provenance. Because texts which post-date GJohn may shed light on earlier texts or traditions, there may be occasion to consider texts which date from, in some cases, as late as the third century AD. However, pride of place will be given to texts and traditions which antedate or are roughly contemporaneous with GJohn, since these provide the clearest window into the milieu in which John’s own thought was formed.
- (iv) Parallels must also take account of the meaning, function, and significance of the divine Name as it occurs in its respective literary contexts. As will be demonstrated, superficially similar language is often undergirded by fundamentally different convictions about the significance of the divine Name.

Aspects of the Divine Name Concept

In addition to these considerations, it is important here to define and distinguish the “significance” of the divine Name from other dimensions or aspects of John’s Name concept, since significance provides a window into impetus. In the first century, the divine Name was a rich concept, offering a wide scope for thinkers and religious practitioners alike, and as such was

⁸⁹ See Paul Foster, “Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament,” *JSNT* 38 (2015): 96-111.

deployed for various reasons and with varying connotations.⁹⁰ A name touched on various aspects of a person, which were highly significant. In this context, an analysis of John's use of the Name concept accommodates four distinguishable aspects: referent, function, meaning, and significance.

a) Names in Greco-Roman Tradition

In the ancient world, belief was widespread that a name was bound up with the person to which it referred. The term ὄνομα sometimes had the connotation of a person's "reputation" or the account or responsibility of someone (e.g., Rev 3.1, 4); it could also mean simply the person or thing itself.⁹¹ Beyond this, the Stoics, followed by Philo and Origen, thought there was an essential relationship between words and reality.⁹² They would have agreed with Hesiod, who sought to know the gods through the etymological study of their names (Theog., 188-189). Consequently, the excellence of a deity could be reflected in a superfluity of names. Or, in some Hellenistic traditions, divine ineffability was conveyed through anonymity or namelessness (e.g., *C. H.* 3; cf. Philo *Vit. Mos.* 1.75). This belief was not ubiquitous, however: In contrast to the Stoics, Plato and the Sophists saw little essential relationship between language and the physical world, or between a name and its bearer.⁹³ For Plato, words and names were merely signs, whose meaning

⁹⁰ For general discussion of the "name" and divine Name language, see Grether, *Name und Wort*; Benno, *Im Namen Gottes*; Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*; Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 242-283; Daniel Prem Niles, *The Name of God in Israel's Worship: The Theological Importance of the Name Yahweh* (Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1975); Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: Lešakkēn Šemô Šām in the Bible* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002); Park-Taylor, *Yahweh: the Divine Name in the Bible*; Parkinson, "In the Name of Jesus"; Hartman, *Into the Name*; New, "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands," 121-139; McDonough, *YHWH at Patmos*, 123-194. Robert G. Bratcher, "'The Name' in Prepositional Phrases in the New Testament," *BT* 14 (1963): 72-80. Martin Rose, "Names of God in the OT," *ABD* 4, ed. David Noel Freedman, 1001-1011 (New York: Doubleday, 1992). Robbert M. van den Berg, "Does it Matter to Call God Zeus? Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 24-25 against the Greek Intellectual on Divine Names," in *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*, ed. George H. van Kooten (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 170-175.

⁹¹ Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 244-245.

⁹² See van den Berg, "Origen on Divine Names," 169-182. Hans Bietenhard, "Name," in *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids, MI: Paternoster Press, 1986), 648. Idem, "ὄνομα," 264. Philo thought a name was like a shadow attached to a body (Decal. 82), and Origen attributed magical properties to the pronunciation of the divine names *Sabaoth* and *Adonai* in Hebrew—although, in contrast to the Stoics, Origen identified these names with the divine, not with material things (Origen, *Contra Celsum* I.24).

⁹³ See van den Berg, "Origen on Divine Names," 173-175. Similarly, Herodotus probably thought divine names from different peoples referred to the same reality (Herodotus, *Histories* II 50; 3.2). See *ibid.*, 170-172.

is assigned through use and custom (e.g., Crat. 388, 435; Polit. 261); a divine name does not fully “correspond” to the deity.⁹⁴ Similarly, the Sophists distinguished ὄνομα from φύσις.⁹⁵

Related to the possible relationship of names to their bearers, there was a belief in some circles that names contained the power associated with the deity. Consequently, knowledge of a divine name could grant one leverage in petitioning the deity, gaining his protection or help.⁹⁶ As Bietenhard puts it: “The name is thus a power which is very closely associated with the bearer and which discloses his nature. Pronouncement or invocation of the name sets in operation the energy potentially contained in him.”⁹⁷ This is seen most clearly in some rabbinical traditions, Jewish and Christian mystical traditions, and in Greek magical texts, as will be discussed in chapters 2 and 3 below.

b) Names and the Divine Name in Jewish Tradition

Within Jewish tradition, name (שם) could mean reputation (e.g., Isa 55.13; Ps 23.3), or even the “memory” of someone—indeed זכר is rendered as ὄνομα in Deuteronomy 25.19. Actions conducted “in the name of” someone suggest they are made with his authorisation, or as commissioned by him (e.g., 1 Kgs 21.8). There was also the idea that names could communicate something of their bearer, as is reflected in the attention to the meaning of names: Nabal was a fool (1 Sam 25.25), Jacob a heel-grasper (Gen 25.26), Babel the place where God confused human languages (Gen 11.9), and Jesus one who “saves” (Matt 1.21). Thus a change of name could signify a change in role or identity (Gen 17.5; 32.28; Rev 3.12), or signal a transfer of allegiance or ownership (Isa 43.7).

Similarly, the divine שם could function in a variety of ways—often determined by the expression within which שם occurs. The revelation of God’s Name signified the revelation of his very self (Exod 3.13-15).⁹⁸ And his people could invoke his attention or presence by calling on his Name (יהוה בשם in Gen 4.26; Zeph 3.9). As with pagan deities, the divine Name was regarded by

⁹⁴ Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 249. But interestingly, Plato still derives some meaning from etymologies (e.g., Plato, Crat. 395e-396a).

⁹⁵ Ibid., 246-247.

⁹⁶ See, e.g., New, “The Name,” 121-123.

⁹⁷ Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 243.

⁹⁸ “Der schem jahwe...bedeutet Jahwe als *Deus revelatus*....” Grether, *Name und Wort*, 40. See similarly Rose, “Names of God in the OT,” 1002; von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, 179-187.

some as having apotropaic or numinous qualities.⁹⁹ Agents of divine will or speech are identified as speaking or acting יהוה בשם (e.g., Deut 18.20; 1 Sam 17.45). Similarly, the placement of God's Name in his angel (Exod 23.20) seems to indicate that God himself was somehow active or present in or through his angel; and the Name in the Temple (e.g. Deut 12.5) likely signified the establishment of divine authority and ownership over Temple, people, and land.¹⁰⁰ There is certainly a sense in which the divine Name stood at the heart of Israel's relationship to God himself: Entrusted by God to Israel, it was at the heart of liturgical and cultic practice, and functioned to identify Temple, people, and divine agents as belonging to God, or as representative of Him.¹⁰¹ Similar functions were accorded Jesus' name by the early Christians.¹⁰²

To be sure, there was interest in some circles in the particular "Name" of God. Jacob, Manoah, and Moses all inquire of God his particular name.¹⁰³ The covenant Name, YHWH, in particular, is closely related to several aspects of the broader divine Name concept, and was the unique name appealed to within the cult.¹⁰⁴ It is the particular name disclosed to Moses in the burning bush narrative (Exod 3.14-15), and called before him on Sinai (Exod 34.5-6). In Jewish circles, יהוה/ὄνομα came to be used as a reverential substitute for the covenant Name, YHWH/κύριος. Josephus, for instance, uses ὄνομα to refer to the Name engraved on the high priest's turban (Ant. 11.8.5), which was YHWH/κύριος.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, when quoting Scripture in schools, יהוה was used as a substitute for יהוה.¹⁰⁶ And most scholars take Paul's reference to τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομάτων (Phil 2.9) to refer to κύριος (Phil 2.11), which most likely represents the

⁹⁹ See, e.g., Grether, *Der Name*, 18-25; New, "The Name," 125.

¹⁰⁰ Pace Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 256-257, who follows von Rad here. Sandra Richter has argued persuasively on the basis of the related Akkadian phrase *šuma šakānu* that the placement of the divine Name in the Temple was used to denote ownership, not the presence of a hypostasis. Richter, *Name Theology*, esp. 143-144. See further discussion in chapter 3.

¹⁰¹ Bietenhard, "Name," 649-650.

¹⁰² See, e.g., Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*; Hartman, *Into the Name*; Parkinson, "In the Name of Jesus;" New, "The Name," 123-136.

¹⁰³ Gen 32.30; Judg 13.17-18; Exod 3.13. By contrast, Philo thought God had no proper name: κύριος and θεός simply denoted divine powers. See chapter 2, n.87.

¹⁰⁴ Rose, "Names of God in the OT," 1002.

¹⁰⁵ Exod 28:36-37. Philo describes this name as τέτταρας ἔχον γλῶσσας ὀνόματος—hinting perhaps at the Tetragrammaton (Vit. Mos. 2.114).

¹⁰⁶ Or sometimes אלהים. See m. Meg. 4.3; m. Ber. 7.3; 9.5; m. Sanh. 7.5. Thus Bietenhard calls the Tetragrammaton "the name *par excellence*" (emphasis his). Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," 268-269. Interestingly, the LXX heightens the HB prohibition against blaspheming (בְּקוֹל) the Name to ὀνομάζων δὲ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (Lev 24.16).

covenant Name YHWH.¹⁰⁷ Such interchangeability between ‘Name’ and ‘YHWH’ leads scholars such as Heitmüller to suggest that the covenant Name, YHWH, was at the heart of the divine Name category.¹⁰⁸ Consequently, it is most likely that, in a first century document with deep roots in Jewish tradition such as GJohn, references to the divine ὄνομα likely drew upon the divine Name concept, at the heart of which stood the covenant Name, YHWH. In other words, if there is any particular “name,” underlying references to the divine ὄνομα in GJohn, there is no stronger candidate than יהוה/YHWH, or the conventional Greek reverential substitute κύριος.¹⁰⁹ In chapters 2 and 3, I will suggest that the disciples’ post-resurrection recognition of Jesus as ὁ κύριος (20.18, 25, 28) may function as a narrative illustration of Jesus’ claim to have been given the ὄνομα, which he reveals to his followers.

c) The “Significance” of the Name in GJohn

This does not mean, however, that one may simply substitute YHWH/κύριος for every occurrence of ὄνομα within GJohn. It is clear from the preceding discussion that the uses of name language in the wider Greek and Jewish tradition go far beyond a simple reference to a specific name; and conversely, the covenant Name, YHWH, can only be understood in the context of a range of aspects and functions of the wider divine Name concept. Likewise, John is far more interested in the meaning, function, and significance of the divine Name category than he is with any particular referent, such as “YHWH.” It is highly unlikely, for instance, that Jesus’ claim to have revealed the Name (John 17.6) meant that he had disclosed to his followers the Tetragrammaton—a Name with which they were already well familiar! Thus, we must attend to the immediate context in which ὄνομα occurs in GJohn, to determine the *function(s)* and *meaning(s)* of the language as he deploys it. Three times, ὄνομα occurs in a prepositional phrase

¹⁰⁷ See chapter 3, n.105.

¹⁰⁸ “[D]as Tetragramm, den Jahve-Namen...steht dieser Name im Zentrum der jüdische Namen-Philosophie, soweit sie die Gottesnamen umfasst.” Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 146. Similarly, von Rad notes that “Jahweh had one name, and...Israel never had any idea of piling up many names upon Jahweh.” von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, 185. Also Grether, *Name und Wort*, 3; Bietenhard, “ὄνομα,” 268-269.

¹⁰⁹ The suggestion that the Name in GJohn is “I am” is likely too simplistic. See n.60. There may be overlap between “I am” and the divine Name in GJohn at the level of meaning or function, but the Name concept derives a great deal of its theological import from the Tetragrammaton. Another proposal, made by Schlatter and others is that the Name is πατήρ. Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er Spricht, Denkt und Glaubt* (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1930), 319-320. However, within GJohn, πατήρ is not used as a name, but as a title or role. McPolin is closer with his suggestion that the Name means the revelation of God as Father; but this *meaning* need not dictate the Name *referent*. McPolin, “The Name,” 124, 130.

(ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) to indicate that the Name functions, in part, to authorize Jesus (5.43; 10.25; 12.13). In 17.11-12, it functions as a sphere of protection or fidelity in which believers abide, and consequently by which they are identified. But, as the object of verbs of glorification and revelation (12.28, 17.6, 26), the Name also functions as the focal point of Jesus' mission. Furthermore, whereas ὄνομα could denote YHWH at one level, more importantly, it connotes a range of *meanings*, which may be determined by attending primarily to the various contexts in which ὄνομα occurs.¹¹⁰ Most commentators gloss over the question of referent and assume that ὄνομα simply means God himself.¹¹¹ Although the studies by McPolin and Untergassmair are more nuanced, they are occupied primarily with this question of meaning. From referent, function, and meaning, one may yet distinguish the *significance* of ὄνομα. The significance may be determined by attending, both to the meaning of ὄνομα and to its placement in the context of John's narrative. For instance, while the *meaning* of ὄνομα in 17.6 includes the idea of revelation, the *significance* of the Name here incorporates the fact that Name-revelation appears at the climax of the Farewell Discourse as a summary of Jesus' entire mission. The distinctions help to avoid oversimplification.¹¹²

In addition, the isolation of "significance" from referent, function, and meaning provides a means of determining the impetus for John's interest in the divine Name. As noted earlier, various influences are reflected in the function and meaning of the divine ὄνομα in GJohn, but the primary impetus for John's interest in the divine Name category is reflected in the significance of the Name. In chapter 1, I will argue that the role played by the divine Name in Isaiah was the primary impetus, or generative force, for John's interest in and attraction to the divine Name category. I am not arguing that John's divine Name expressions constitute allusions to specific passages in Isaiah, but rather that Isaiah played a prominent role in shaping John's convictions about the divine Name category. Moreover, the impetus need not necessarily account for every aspect of the *function* or *meaning* of ὄνομα in GJohn. These are likely to have been shaped by (and therefore reflect) a number of background influences, as well as John's own unique nuances and

¹¹⁰ James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

¹¹¹ See n.3.

¹¹² Gieschen draws a false dichotomy when he argues that the Name in John 17 is YHWH, over-against "most commentators" who think that it "denotes" the revealed character of God. Charles Gieschen, "The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology," *VC* 57 (2003): 36, n.79. Similarly, Thompson suggests conversely that there can be no external referent for "Name," which is used simply as an equivalent for divine authority or power. Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John*, 49. However, if we distinguish referent from meaning and function, there is room for both.

emphases. However, the impetus is most likely to be reflected in that which is most *significant* about the Name. Thus, in chapters 2—4, I will endeavour to identify the significance of the Name, and thereby determine the primary impetus. The usefulness of these heuristic categories can best be evaluated by observing how they contribute to the clarity of the discussion which follows.

Part I

Chapter 1: The Significance of Isaiah for John's Divine Name Concept

John's particular emphasis on the divine Name raises the question of why he was so drawn to this concept. In the following chapter, it is proposed that Isaiah was a primary catalyst for John's interest in the divine Name. The argument will be developed in a series of steps which seek to:

- (i) Outline John's general interpretation of and dependence on Isaiah
- (ii) Note John's indebtedness to Isaiah for his glory language and "I am" sayings
- (iii) Trace the relationship of these concepts to the divine Name within Isaiah as a thematic cluster
- (iv) Outline briefly the influence of this thematic cluster in GJohn.

Isaiah in GJohn

It is widely recognized that John is significantly indebted to the text and themes of Isaiah. After the Psalms, John quotes most frequently from Isaiah, with four citations: Isaiah 40.3 (in John 1.23); 54.13 (in John 6.45); 53.1 and 6.10 (in John 12.38-39).¹ Moreover, citations from Isaiah occupy a prominent position: Occurring at the beginning of John's narrative (1.23) and at the conclusion of Jesus' public ministry (12.38, 40), and connected explicitly to the prophet Isaiah, they form an *inclusio* around the so-called Book of Signs.

¹ John 12.14-15 may cite Isaiah 40.9 and/or 62.11, but as the primary reference is likely to Zechariah 9.9, it is better to regard these as allusions. Scholars are in general agreement that John's basic text is the LXX, or at least the pre-Aquila recension. See major studies by Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 126, 130. Reim, *Studien*, 225-232. Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 205. Anthony T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 249. Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 151. I refer to the "Old Greek" as "LXX" for ease of discussion, recognizing that we cannot be certain of the source text with which John was familiar. He follows the LXX exactly four times (10.34; 12.13, 38; 19.24), and otherwise he appears to adapt the LXX wording, usually for christological reasons. He may translate directly from the Hebrew twice, where it better suits his purposes (12.40 and 13.18), although it is possible that in these instances, he is citing from an unknown *Vorlage*. See Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 121; Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 97, 106. A freer interpretive approach to OT citation accords with John's approach to the OT in general. Unless otherwise indicated, all OT references indicate LXX versification, with MT versification in square brackets [] where it differs from the LXX. All Greek LXX text is taken from *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. 16 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-Present. All English translations are my own.

Although space does not permit a thorough analysis of these citations, three major sets of inferences may be drawn from them which help to construct the hermeneutic with which John read Isaiah, and thus how he is likely to have interpreted the Name in Isaiah. First, for John, Isaiah is a witness to Jesus,² and Jesus is the subject of the whole of Isaiah, i.e., the ultimate eschatological revelation of which Isaiah wrote.³ Three of John's Isaiah citations feature what will be *seen* (Isa 40.3; 53.1; 6.10; cf. 6.1), perhaps because John regarded the prophet's vision in Isaiah 6 as bound up with the broader vision of eschatological glory described throughout the prophecy.⁴ Interestingly, Isaiah's vision of the coming Lord (Isa 40.3-5) gives expression to the witness of the Baptizer: εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, where the "Lord" is Jesus himself.⁵ Perhaps likewise, John identified the testimony of 1.14 (καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ), with the testimony of those who bore witness to the Servant's glory: καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν (Isa 53.2; cf. John 12.38).⁶ Thus for John, the text of Isaiah gives expression to both the witness of the prophet and that of Johannine Christians. This convergence of testimony is possible because Isaiah's entire vision features Jesus.⁷ The claim that the prophet saw Jesus' glory (12.41) takes up the whole of Isaiah's prophecy as a witness to the future earthly mission of Jesus.⁸ For John, Jesus is the κύριος of Isaiah 6.1, whose

² All John's citations are "individual enactments of the positive witnessing role of Scripture." Catrin H. Williams, "He Saw His Glory and Spoke About Him: The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology," in *Honouring the Past and Shaping the Future: Religious and Biblical Studies in Wales: Essays in Honour of Gareth Lloyd Jones*, ed. Robert Pope (Leominster, Herefordshire: Antony Rowe, 2003), 55.

³ Ibid., 56-57. See also Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 387.

⁴ Isa 40.5; 52.14; 58.8; 60.1-2; 66.18-19; cf. "vision" in Isa 1.1.

⁵ By eliding two lines from Isaiah 40.3 into one, John stresses, not that John prepares the way as a precursor to Jesus, but that the "way" on which Jesus comes from the Father back to the Father (John 14.1-7) actualizes Isaiah's promise of the coming of "the Lord." Thus references to Jesus as the "one who comes" follow the Baptizer's announcement. Williams, "He Saw His Glory and Spoke About Him," 60. Idem, "Isaiah in John's Gospel," in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 104.

⁶ Gordon D. Kirchhevel makes a similar point by comparing Tg. Isa. 53.2 with John 1.12, 14. Gordon D. Kirchhevel, "The Children of God and the Glory That John 1:14 Saw," *BBR* 6 (1996): 87.

⁷ Catrin H. Williams, "Patriarchs and Prophets Remembered: Framing Israel's Past in the Gospel of John," in *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, ed. Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 209.

⁸ Isaiah 6.1; 40.5; 52.13-53.1 are all in view in the "vision" of Isaiah 1.1, which is taken up in Sirach 48.22-25 to refer to the whole of Isaiah. Furthermore, although for John, Isaiah may have seen the pre-existent *Logos*, he more likely saw Jesus' future ministry. In the first century, there was a widespread view that Isaiah as a whole was eschatological. Josephus celebrates Isaiah's predictive powers (e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 10.35), and in Sirach, he is regarded primarily as a seer of the future (Sir. 48.24-25). Ben Sira may have

glory Isaiah saw; and he is the “I” who speaks to Isaiah in 6.10, and is distinguished from θεός in 6.12 (John 12.40-41). The eschatological teaching of God described in Isaiah 54.13 is Jesus’ teaching (6.45);⁹ indeed the disciple is “taught by God” *by* heeding Jesus and *by* coming to him.¹⁰ And Isaiah’s rejected “report” (ἀκοή in Isa 53.1; cf. 6.10), which entails the broader vision of Isaiah 52—53 and secondarily the whole of Isaiah,¹¹ fundamentally concerns the eschatological revelation of the “Arm of the Lord,” who for John is Jesus himself (12.38).¹² Consequently, one’s response to

been the first to regard the servant of Isaiah 49 as an eschatological figure (whom he identifies as Elijah) who will “restore the tribes of Jacob” (Sir. 48.10; cf. Isa 49.6). At Qumran, figures or passages in Isaiah were routinely interpreted eschatologically, or “for the last days” in the pesharim, such as Shear-Jashub (4Q161 frags. 2-6 col. II 1-9; 4Q163 frags. 4-6, col. II.10-21), or the leaders in Isaiah 30.15-17 who are taken to refer to the Pharisees (4Q163 frag. 23 col. II.10-11). See Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 106-128. John may, similarly, have regarded Isaiah’s vision as being of Jesus’ future glory. This accords with how he regards Abraham (8.56), and with the function of John 12.41 to explain the negative Jewish reaction to Jesus’ earthly activity (12.37-43). Catrin H. Williams, “‘Seeing the Glory’: The Reception of Isaiah’s Call-Vision in John 12.41,” in *Judaism, Jewish Identities and the Gospel Tradition*, ed. James G. Crossley (London: Equinox Press, 2010), 196-200.

⁹ Most scholars agree that John 6.45 here cites from Isaiah 54.13. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 57. Williams, “Isaiah in John’s Gospel,” 107. As the citation is introduced by the plural “prophets,” a second passage such as Jeremiah 31.33-34 could also be in view. However, it was not unusual to refer to “the prophets” in general when only one reference was intended. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.3-5; Justin Martyr *Dial.* 89.3; Mek. Exod 17.14; b. Sanh. 90b. See Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 69-71. Related to this, John closely associates Jesus’ word with Scripture (2.22; 17.12; 18.9), and perhaps also Jesus’ identity as the *Logos* with the “word of God” (10.35). See Andreas Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 427.

¹⁰ The idea here accords with the fact that those who may be taught of God—described elsewhere as being “from God” (8.47), born “of God” (1.13) or born “again/from above” (3.3, 7)—are those who have been drawn to and received the word from *Jesus* (17.14). Moreover, the identification of Jesus, the true Bread, with the teaching from God, may reflect the common presentation of the Law as manna or “food” (e.g., Deut 8.2-3; Sir. 24.21-23; Wis. 16.26; Ps 18[19].10; 118[119].103). See discussion in Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity, According to John* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 455-458.

¹¹ The report (ἀκοή) of the Arm is the report (ἀκοή) of good news in Isaiah 52.7. The Targumist, referring in Tg. Isa 53.1 to “*this* (סֵד) our report,” appears to have read it this way, as does Paul, who regards the gospel of Christ as the “good news” or “report” spoken of in Isaiah 52.17 and 53.1 (respectively) in Romans 10.16. Cf. Heb 4.2. The word ἀκοή appears in Isaiah elsewhere only in the commissioning (Isa 6.10). All translations of Isaiah Targum taken from *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*, trans. Bruce Chilton (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

¹² The majority of scholars assume that the “Arm” refers to Jesus’ signs. See list in Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 88, n. 15. However, in Isaiah 53.1-2, the “arm of the Lord” is identified as the Servant: “to whom has the Arm...been revealed?...We saw him (αὐτόν).” Since the “whom” is the “we” of verse 2, the Arm must be the Servant whom they see. See n.77. It is also odd to posit the signs as the Arm in John 12, since signs in GJohn are never “revealed,” but “done” (ποιέω). And signs can generate faith only because they reveal something about *Jesus* (3.2; 4.48; 6.2, 14, 30; 9.16; 12.18, 37). Thus for John, as for Isaiah, the Arm is Jesus, the Servant.

Jesus is the index of whether one has read Isaiah correctly, and a rejection of Jesus constitutes a rejection of Isaiah's testimony.¹³ For John, Isaiah is a witness to Jesus, who is the object of his eschatological vision.

Second, John regarded the Isaianic texts he cites as embedded in a wider Isaianic network, and conversely such networks exert influence on the broader context in GJohn (which would follow if he indeed regarded Jesus as the subject of Isaiah's entire vision).¹⁴ For instance, the Baptizer's witness to Jesus is identified with the voice of Isaiah 40.3 (John 1.23) immediately following a priestly delegation from Jerusalem (1.19) that may reflect John's awareness of Isaiah 40.2: "Priests, speak to the heart of Jerusalem."¹⁵ In addition, the content of the Baptizer's witness is supplied by the wider context of Isaiah: Jesus is the "Lamb of God" (1.29, 36)—an image probably (although perhaps not exclusively) derived from Isaiah 53¹⁶—and the "Chosen one" of Isaiah 42.1 (John 1.34).¹⁷ His witness to "the light" (1.7) could derive similarly from the Isaianic

¹³ Williams, "Seeing the Glory," 199.

¹⁴ This is true of John's use of the OT more generally. His citation formulae sometimes introduce a text of uncertain origin (7.12, 38, 42; 19.28), or an unspecified text (6.31, 45; 12.14-15; 15.25; 19.36), because he regards the OT, not as a quarry for proof-texts, but as the "comprehensive unity" upon which new revelation rests." C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 38 (1947): 168.

¹⁵ Thus, Reim observes: "Durch das Zitat vertreten, steht die gesamte Erwartung von Jes 40,1ff vor dem Leser des Evangeliums." Reim, *Studien*, 5. Similarly Williams, "He Saw His Glory and Spoke About Him," 61-62. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 3-5.

¹⁶ Although there have certainly been excesses in claims about the Servant theme by NT exegetes, it is still plausible to consider that John's lamb has been coloured to some extent by Isaiah 53, *pace* Morna D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1959), 110. The "lamb" imagery in Isaiah 53.4 οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει, is strikingly similar to John's ὁ αἵρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου (φέρω and αἵρω can be used to render the same Hebrew verb). John has Jesus, not Simon, bear the cross, perhaps to highlight that he bears the sins of many himself (John 19.17), as in Isaiah 53.11. Reim, *Studien*, 176-179. Anthony T. Hanson, "John's Use of Scripture," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 371. Peter Stuhlmacher, "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 159-160. Stibbe and Porter think the imagery of the paschal lamb is primary. Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 35. Stanley E. Porter, "Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfilment Motif and the Passover Theme," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 407-421. It is also possible that John has conflated Servant and paschal imagery. Brown, I: 61-63; Lindars, 109.

¹⁷ Although manuscript support for the variant "chosen one" (κ* b e ff*) is weaker than "son of God," it is the more difficult reading, as "son of God" is more Johannine. Furthermore, an allusion to Isaiah 42 here makes sense of the fact that the Spirit remaining on Jesus is what alerts the Baptizer to his identity as the Chosen one: "I have given my spirit upon him" (Isa 42.1). So Reim, *Studien*, 163. Williams, "He Saw His Glory and Spoke About Him," 61-62. Brown, I: 57. *Pace* Bultmann, 92, n.6.

Servant's role as a φῶς ἐθνῶν (Isa 42.6; 49.6).¹⁸ Moreover, as the Isaianic Voice made straight the way for divine glory to be seen (Isa 40.5), so Johannine representative(s) join the Baptizer in testifying concerning Jesus, "we beheld his glory" (1.14).

To take another example, John has juxtaposed citations of Isaiah 6.10 and 53.1 (12.38-40) because both passages in context share the theme of obduracy and the language of glory and exaltation.¹⁹ Similarly, in the citation of Isaiah 6.10, John's introduction of the verb τυφλόω in the first line and adaptation of the final line to καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ, may indicate that he read Isaiah 6 alongside 44.18b: "They do not understand in order to perceive, because they are blinded from seeing with their eyes and from understanding with their hearts (τοῦ νοῆσαι τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν)."²⁰

And again, although John cites only Isaiah 53.1 in John 12.38, the broader context of Isaiah 52—53 is reflected throughout John 12. The passages share the theme of divine kingship (Isa 52.7; John 12.12-19). The vision of Jesus by "all humanity" and symbolized by "some Greeks" (12.20-21, 32) accords with foreigners beholding the exalted Servant (Isa 52.15). The deaths of the Servant and of Jesus are for others (Isa 53.8; John 12.24-25, 32-33),²¹ and linked with exaltation (Isa 52.13; John 12.23, 32).²² And, as the arrival of Jesus' hour in John 12 is punctuated by divine Name glorification

¹⁸ The correspondence between Jesus' role as light and Isaiah 42.6 is one of five indicators listed by Reim that John intends to present Jesus as the Isaianic Servant. Reim, *Studien*, 180-181.

¹⁹ This is true in both the MT and LXX. As the Servant is exalted (ὑψωθήσεται) and glorified (δοξασθήσεται) (52.13), so Isaiah sees the Lord ὑψηλοῦ, and the house is full τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ (6.1). In addition, "wrongdoing," "failure" and "touch" (6.7) appear in 53.4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12. "Hear," "see," "consider" from 6.9 recur in 59.15. And "heal," "desolate/appall," and "seed" (6.10, 11, 13) recur in 52.14; 53.5, 10. Also, ἄκοή appears in Isaiah only in Isaiah 6.10, 52.7, 53.1. See Craig A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 133. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 101. John's juxtaposition of these passages is a classic example of the rabbinic principle of *gezerah shawah*.

²⁰ Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 117. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 105. John may be employing here the rabbinical technique known as *Binyan 'ab mikathub 'ehad* ("building up a family from a single text"), i.e., when the same phrase is found in a number of passages, then a consideration found in one of them applies to all of them." Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 20. Brown's alternate suggestion that John has blended Isaiah 6 with Deuteronomy 29.3-4 is less likely, since Isaiah is already clearly in John's mind (12.38). Brown, I: 486. The presence of the theme in John 9.39 is too remote to help account for τυφλόω here, and may itself be undergirded by Isaiah 6.9. See Evans, *To See and Not Perceive*, 129-130.

²¹ Cf. 3.14-16, and the use of ὑπέρ in several places (6.51; 10.11, 15; 11.50-52; 15.13; 18.14).

²² Evans points out that the key terms ὑψοῦν and δοξάζειν, which appear together in Isaiah 52.13, have had a significant influence on John 12 and John's theology more generally. Evans, "The Voice from Heaven," 407. Cf. Brown, I:146, 485.

(12.28), so the promise of Isaiah 52—53 features Name-revelation “in that day” (Isa 52.6). Thus it seems likely that John 12 represents John’s reflection on the broader context of Isaiah 52—53.²³

It will come as no surprise, then, to discover that John’s indebtedness to Isaiah extends beyond explicitly cited passages. Indeed, John has a preference for evoking themes and images, and alluding to passages, rather than explicit citation. As C. K. Barrett observed, “Though John uses the O.T. he uses it in a novel manner, collecting its sense rather than quoting.”²⁴ This is no less apparent than in John’s use of Isaiah, to which he alludes frequently.²⁵ So Günther Reim notes:

Kein Buch des AT hat die Theologie des Johannes stärker geprägt als Dtjes und keiner der Verfasser neutestamentlicher Schriften ist von Dtjes so stark beeinflusst wie Johannes, in dessen Evangelium wir auch die universale Weite bewundern, wie wir sie bei Dtjes bewundern können.²⁶

Moreover, there are indications within GJohn that John expected his readers to pick up on his more allusive engagement with Isaianic themes. John coaches his readers to recognize deeper levels of meaning in the narrative through the use of such devices as irony,²⁷ or through retrospective comments that encourage readers to interpret from a post-resurrection perspective (2.22; 12.16). Perhaps similarly, John expected the deeper meaning of the Scriptures and their fulfillment in Jesus to be accessible only to the eyes of faith.²⁸ This applies particularly to Isaiah.²⁹

²³ See Catrin H. Williams, “The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology,” in *As Those Who are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, ed. Claire Mathew McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 118–121. It is unnecessary to infer from the numerous links between John 12.1–43 and Isaiah 52.7–53.12 that John 12 is a “midrash” on the Isaiah passage, as Evans does. Craig A. Evans, “Obduracy and the Lord’s Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*, ed. William F. Stinespring and Craig A. Evans (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 232–236.

²⁴ Barrett, “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” 156.

²⁵ NA²⁸ lists around 34 possible allusions to Isaiah in GJohn, which can be taken, at least, to indicate the profound impact of Isaiah on John’s thought.

²⁶ Reim, *Studien*, 183. Several scholars have made similar comments. See, e.g., Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, 355; Hanson, “John’s Use of Scripture,” 376; Williams, “Isaiah in John’s Gospel,” 101. Note that Reim doubts whether John had the text of Isaiah before him, since his echoes never exactly agree with Isaiah.

²⁷ Saeed Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 75–85.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 122.

²⁹ Lincoln argues that John’s ideal reader is an informed reader, who will not fail to pick up echoes from Isaiah. Andrew Lincoln, “Trials, Plots and the Narrative of the Fourth Gospel,” *JSNT* 56 (1994): 22.

Closely related to this second hermeneutical inference is a third: John regarded general *concepts* he derives from Isaiah as embedded in a wider network or cluster of Isaianic concepts or themes. This will be illustrated later in this chapter, but for now it is sufficient to note that scholars have recognized a variety of ways in which John appears to think in clusters. For instance, in addition to his tendency to read various passages in Isaiah in light of one another, John is fond of repeating themes with variations of language or expression that encourage readers to compare certain concepts. So, for instance, Jesus' prayer "Glorify your name" (12.28) is repeated almost verbatim in 17.1 with the variation "glorify your son," just as the theophanic reply "I have glorified it and will glorify it again" is echoed by Jesus' promise "I have made known your name and I will make it known" (17.26). Here the verbs "glorify" and "reveal" and the nouns "Name" and "Son" are juxtaposed for the reader's consideration.

Furthermore, recent studies of metaphor and symbol in GJohn have noted that John tends to juxtapose and superimpose images for Christ on one another in a kind of "cluster technique."³⁰ In John 4, for instance, Jesus is water, groom, prophet, worship place, Saviour, Christ, and "I am." And the Father/Son metaphor has been so blended with the Sender/sent metaphor that the result is formulaic: "the *Father sent* me" (3.17; 5.23).³¹ The metaphoric networks which pervade the Gospel may be the result of a thematic clustering pattern of thought. In presenting Jesus as the "good shepherd," John may have been led thematically to present him also as the door to the sheepfold, or indeed as the Lamb. Likewise, Jesus is both king and prophet, the best wine and the Vine, living water and bread of life. It is likely that he read Isaiah in a similar way.

In summary, from John's citations of Isaiah, we may draw several inferences. The prominence and placement of the citations themselves reflect the importance and pervasive influence of Isaiah on John. Furthermore, John's tendency to read passages in Isaiah as embedded in a network of passages accords with the thematic clustering pattern of his thought. And this posture toward Isaiah is grounded in his conviction that Isaiah bore witness ultimately to Jesus. These inferences provide us with an opportunity, then, to think John's thoughts after him. In what follows, it will be proposed that John's divine Name concept is embedded in a thematic cluster

³⁰ Ruben Zimmermann, "Imagery in John: Opening up Paths into the Tangled Thicket of John's Figurative World," in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*, ed. Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 31.

³¹ Ibid.

along with two Johannine themes, which are derived primarily (although not exclusively) from Isaiah, namely, the (non-predicative) “I am” sayings and the “glory” motif in GJohn. Since John is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for these concepts, and since they are intertwined with the divine Name in Isaiah, and similarly in GJohn, it follows that his interest in the divine Name is similarly generated by Isaiah.

Isaiah’s “I am” and “Glory” in GJohn

Although the “I am” expression and glory language have been thoroughly integrated into John’s own distinctive Christology, a glance through most commentaries and monographs bears out the relatively uncontroversial point that John is indebted primarily to Isaiah for these categories. Nevertheless, a brief discussion is in order here.

First, John’s non-predicative “I am” sayings³² derive primarily from Isaiah.³³ The dramatic response of the crowd to Jesus’ final “I am” statement (18.6) invites readers to see a deeper significance in the claim. When this is combined with the role “I am” statements play in resolving irony generated in Jesus’ dialogues with the Samaritan woman (4.26), with the Jews (8.58), and with Judas and the disciples (13.19),³⁴ Ball is right to conclude that a background must be sought which can account for the “enigma” surrounding the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι.³⁵ He goes on to argue that Deutero-Isaiah supplies this background, where the expression “I am he” (אני הוּא/ἐγώ εἰμι) occurs repeatedly, signifying the exclusivity and sovereignty of YHWH, often polemically over-against idols.³⁶

Williams bolsters his case by arguing convincingly that the presentation and function of John’s “I am” statements “bear striking resemblance to the setting and purpose of אֲנִי הוּא in its role as a succinct expression of unique divinity and sovereignty.”³⁷ To take one example, the “I am”

³² John 4.26; 6.20; 8.24, 28, 58; 13.19; 18.5-8. For further discussion of 4.26, and its inclusion within the “I am” sayings, see chapter 2.

³³ See Introduction for list of scholars who have argued for this.

³⁴ This “irony,” is generated by playing off the ignorance of characters against the knowledge of the reader, or the surface assertion of the speaker against a deeper implied meaning. Ball, *I Am*, 52-53. Readers know that Jesus is “greater than our father Jacob” (4.10) and than Abraham (8.54).

³⁵ Ball, *I Am*, 159.

³⁶ Ibid., 177-203.

³⁷ Williams, *I Am He*, 301.

statements in John 8.24, 28 appear to draw upon Isaiah 43.10.³⁸ In the middle of an Isaianic Trial scene (Isa 43.8-13), YHWH summons Israel and his Servant (just introduced as the “light to the nations”) as witnesses to attest to his unique sovereignty, “so that you may know and believe and understand that I am. There was no other god before me, and there will be none after me” (Isa 43.10). In a similarly forensic and polemical setting, John 8.12-29 records a controversy which arises in response to Jesus’ claim to be the light of the world (v12), and which features claims, charges, and a dispute over the validity of witnesses.³⁹ As the trial scene in Isaiah 43 is directed toward the recognition “that I am,” so John 8:24, 28 reflects, in language parallel to Isaiah 43.10, Jesus’ concern that the people *know* (v28) and *believe* (v24) “that I am.” Beyond these parallels, both passages feature similar themes including blindness, predictive ability, and the soteriological importance of knowing that “I am.”⁴⁰ Williams rightly concludes that John has engaged “thoroughly” with the significance of אֲנִי הוּא in Isaiah, and in doing so, identifies the self-declaration “I am” as “an integral part of Isaiah’s testimony that Jesus is the eschatological revelation of God.”⁴¹

Similarly, it is fairly uncontested that John is particularly indebted to Isaiah for his glory

³⁸ John may allude to the same text in 13.19, where predictive ability is a shared theme. See Reim, *Studien*, 172-173. Harner, *I Am*, 38-39. Others have adduced weaker allusions to Isaiah 43.10, upon which we should not place much weight: Ball sees an allusion in John 6.20. Ball, *I Am*, 202. Lindars and Ronning propose an allusion in 6.24. Lindars, 320. Ronning, “The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature,” 250-254. Schnackenburg and Hanson find one in 6.69, where the language of “know and believe” is combined with the appellation “Holy one of God,” reminiscent of the Isaianic title “Holy one of Israel” (Isa 43.14). See Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 93-94. And John 8.58 may also allude to 43.10, since, as in John 8, Tg. Isa. 43.10-13 adds Abraham: “...I declared to Abraham your father what was about to come...also from eternity I am He.” See Harner, *I Am*, 40. Also Kerr, *Temple*, 330.

³⁹ Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2000), 87.

⁴⁰ Hanson argues that the ambiguous Greek of John 8.25 (τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν) makes best sense against the background of Isaiah 43.9, in which case Jesus is identifying himself as the Lord: “[I am] at the beginning what I am now saying to you.” Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 122. However, at points his argument is tenuous; and the confusion over how to render τὴν ἀρχὴν alerts us to the danger of placing any weight on Hanson’s argument. Some take it as a classical idiom “at all.” Westcott, 131; Bultmann, 352-353. Others as the equivalent of ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς (cf. 8.44; 15.27; so NIV, NKJV). And others take the P66 variant as original: εἶπον ὑμῖν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν (“I told you at the beginning what I am telling you [now]”). Brown, I: 348.

⁴¹ Williams, *I Am He*, 301. Similarly, Idem, “‘I Am’ or ‘I Am He’?: Self-Declaratory Pronouncements in the Fourth Gospel and Rabbinic Tradition,” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 346-348; Harner, *I Am*, 37.

concept.⁴² Jesus' public ministry, characterized by the revelation of divine glory (John 1.14; 2.11; 12.23), is bracketed by citations from Isaianic passages in which divine glory is featured,⁴³ and is concluded by John's explicit identification of Jesus' glory as that which Isaiah saw (12.41). In addition, John juxtaposed citations of Isaiah 6.10 and 53.1 in 12.38-40, not only because glory language occurs in the context of both passages, but because he was particularly drawn to the concept of glory in Isaiah. Hence glory pervades the context of John 12 (vv. 23, 28). Indeed, Isaiah's exalted suffering Servant appears to have shaped John's presentation of Jesus' cross-glorification,⁴⁴ and the association of the glory of the Servant and of God is reflected in the mutual glorification of Father and Son:⁴⁵

Isaiah 49.3, 5: "You are my servant, Israel, and in you I will be glorified...I will be glorified before the Lord"

John 13.31-32: "Now the Son of Man is glorified, and God is glorified in him..."

As noted earlier, for John, Isaiah's entire vision of eschatological glory is the glory of Jesus. So, it is the future glorification of the Servant of Isaiah 52.13 that Isaiah saw. And it is the coming manifestation of divine glory referred to in Isaiah 40.5 to which the "we" of John 1.14 bear witness. In summary, John is indebted primarily to Isaiah for the "I am" expression and his "glory" concept.

⁴² In her recent thorough study of glory in GJohn, Chibici-Revneanu demonstrates the manifold ways John has adopted and deployed a variety of aspects of the OT glory "Motivskonstellation" in his Gospel, and also makes a case for the nuances of Graeco-Roman "honour/shame" in John's concept. Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: Das Verständnis der Doxa im Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). The latter point nuances the conclusion of Caird that John's glory concept derives primarily from LXX, not koine Greek. G. B. Caird, "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics," *NTS* 15 (1969): 267. Similarly, W. R. Cook, "The Glory Motif in the Johannine Corpus," *JETS* 27 (1984): 292. However despite these nuances, she maintains the primary background for John's δόξα concept is Isaiah. Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 495-496. Similarly, Williams, "Isaiah in John's Gospel," 101. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 378. Rainer Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 319-325. James M. Hamilton Jr., "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John," *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 146-147. Jörg Frey, " '...Das sie meine Herrlichkeit Schauen (Joh 17.24):' Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der δόξα Jesu," *NTS* 54 (2008): 383.

⁴³ 1.29 cites Isaiah 40.3 (δόξα in 40.5); 12.38-40 cites Isaiah 6.10 (δόξα in 6.1-3) and Isaiah 53.1 (δοξάζω in 52.13).

⁴⁴ See Reim, *Studien*, 174-175. Similarly, Chibici-Revneanu concludes that John 12.38-40 indicates that the exegetical substructure of Isaiah undergirds John's "spezifisch johanneischen passionstheologischen Anwendung der δόξα-Begrifflichkeit." Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 495.

⁴⁵ Reim observes: " 'Sich verherrlichen in jemandem' ...findet sich im AT nur bei Dtjes (44,23; 49, 3) und im NT nur bei Johannes. Jesus als der Sohn Gottes erfüllt die Aufgabe, die dem Knecht bei Dtjes gestellt ist...." Reim, *Studien*, 174.

Divine Name Cluster in Isaiah

Earlier, it was argued that John read passages in Isaiah in the context of the whole of Isaiah, and exhibits a tendency to think in thematic clusters. In what follows, it will be demonstrated that John is likely to have regarded both the “I am” statements and “glory” concept in Isaiah as clustered conceptually with Isaiah’s divine Name concept. Consequently, Isaiah is likely the primary catalyst for John’s interest in the divine Name concept.

The Divine Name and “I am” sayings in Isaiah

John is likely to have regarded occurrences of *ὄνομα* with reference to God as being within the same conceptual cluster alongside the divine self-expression *ἐγὼ εἰμι*. This is not to say that he regarded the expression as the Name itself.⁴⁶ Although God is designated by several titles or names in Isaiah,⁴⁷ John would likely have understood the implied referent of *ὄνομα* to be the covenant name, YHWH (rendered *κύριος*):⁴⁸ “I am the Lord God (*ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός*), *this*⁴⁹ is my name” (42.8).⁵⁰ However, two variations of the covenant name are explicitly identified with the Name in Isaiah: “the Lord God” (*κύριος ὁ θεός*) (42.8)⁵¹ and “the Lord of hosts” (*κύριος σαβαωθ*) (Isa 47.4; 48.2; 51.15; 54.5).⁵² In addition, unlike any specific names or titles, *ὄνομα* can function grammatically as an object: It can be manifested (52.6),⁵³ profaned (48.11), and shared with⁵⁴ or

⁴⁶ Pace Brown, II: 756; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 93-96.

⁴⁷ E.g., “Saviour” (43.3), “Holy one of Israel” (43.3), “Creator” (43.15), “king” (44.6), “redeemer” (44.24), “your God” (51.15), and “Mighty one of Jacob” (49.26).

⁴⁸ The Greek translation with which John was familiar may have rendered YHWH as *Ιάω* or *κύριος*, or else retained Hebrew lettering. For recent survey of the scholarship on questions surrounding this, see Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton*, 45-88.

⁴⁹ Τοῦτό as opposed to the MT *הוּ* (as in *הוּ הוּ*).

⁵⁰ “The Name (*שְׁמִי*)” was a common surrogate for the Tetragrammaton. Cohon, “Name of God,” 584-592. And Qumran likely interprets the reference to “name” in Isaiah 48.1 as “the great Name” (4Q176a frags. 19-20.1; cf. *Jubilees* 23.21-22). All English translations of DSS are taken from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2d ed., ed. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

⁵¹ “God” is absent from the HB: *אֱלֹהֵינוּ*.

⁵² Isaiah 57.15 may also be considered: “Holy is his name” (MT) or “holy in the holies is his name” (LXX). The HB also links “Redeemer from of old” with the Name in 63.16. The LXX translator frequently renders both YHWH and Adonai, both individually and when they occur together, with a single *κύριος*. Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton*, 83.

⁵³ By contrast, a specific name/title that is manifested must appear in an object clause: “You will know *that* I am the Lord (*ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος*)” (Isa 49.23).

⁵⁴ This will be argued further in what follows.

borne by (43.7) others. These observations suggest that *ὄνομα* should not be regarded *merely* as a synonym for a single referent.

Although the primary referent of *ὄνομα* is often *ὁ κύριος*, it has a polemical function and eschatological significance which parallels the “I am” formula, which itself is related to, although distinguishable from, the covenant name YHWH.⁵⁵ First, both the “I am” expression and the “Name” are the focal point in polemical contexts. The formula “I am” occurs most often in trial speeches, in which YHWH asserts his uniqueness and absolute sovereignty as lord of the earth and of history (41.4; 43.10, 25; 45.18). “I am the Lord” functions similarly.⁵⁶ Likewise, references to the *ὄνομα* of God are deployed as a focal point in the trial speeches and in anti-idol polemic: “I am the Lord, this is my name; my glory I will not give to another” (42.8). Related to this, just as God acts so that his people would know that “I am” (43.10), so he acts for the sake of his Name: “For the sake of my name, I will show you my wrath...” (48.9), and “For my own sake I will do this, because my name is profaned” (48.11). And whereas the problem of profaning the divine Name is countered in Isaiah 48.11-12, 17 with a series of predicative “I am” expressions, in Isaiah 52.5-6 it is countered with eschatological Name-revelation. In Isaiah 52.6, both are explicitly associated: “my people will know *my name* in that day, *that* (ὅτι) I am he who speaks.”⁵⁷

Second, the divine *ὄνομα* has an eschatological significance akin to that of the “I am” expressions. In the context of future salvation “in that day,” God promises: “my people will know

⁵⁵ As noted earlier, the formula “I am” or “I am he” (ἐγὼ εἰμι from the HB אֲנִי הוּא) is frequently employed in Deutero-Isaiah as a self-predication of YHWH (e.g., Isa 46.4; 48.12; 51.12). The expression “I, I YHWH” in Isaiah 43.11 corresponds to “that I am he” in the preceding verse 10. Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, trans., D. M. G. Stalker (London: SCM Press, 1969), 123. Also, the MT of Isaiah 45.18c “I am YHWH” has been rendered in the LXX as ἐγὼ εἰμι. However, Kerr overstates the significance of this when he suggests it indicates the two were “virtually equivalent.” Kerr, *Temple*, 329. Although there is conceptual overlap between YHWH and “I am,” they are yet distinguishable (see Isa 42.6, 8; 43.3, 11, 15; 44.24; 45.5-6, 18; 48.17; 49.23, 26; 51.15; 60.22). Williams has argued persuasively that the “I am he” of Deutero-Isaiah, upon which John draws, is a self-designation in its own right, distinct from YHWH or the “I am” of Exodus 3. Williams, *I Am He*, 40-41.

⁵⁶ Isa 45.8, 19. Note that other predicates for the “I am” expression occur similarly in polemical contexts: “God” (45.22; 46.9; 48.17); “the first” (48.12); “the one comforting you” (51.12); “the one speaking” (52.6).

⁵⁷ The underlying HB here contains the divine self-expression “I am he”: כִּי אֲנִי הוּא הַמְדַּבֵּר. The LXX translator, who often renders this simply with ἐγὼ εἰμι (e.g., 41.4; 43.10; 46.4), has added the object αὐτός here, probably to highlight the underlying HB הוּא, and God’s speaking role: ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτός ὁ λαλῶν. Williams, *I Am He*, 57. See further discussion in chapter 2. Note also that ὅτι could be causal (“for I am he”) or a direct object marker (“that I am he”). John could very easily have read it in the latter sense, given the similar construction in 49.23, in which “I am the Lord” is denoted as the direct object by ὅτι: γνῶσθι ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος.

my name” (Isa 52.6). This does not mean a cognitive event featuring the disclosure of an actual name, but divine self-disclosure in eschatological salvific action. A similar point is conveyed by the “I am” expression: God promises the future restoration and uplifting of his people, which will result in their knowing “that I am the Lord” (Isa 49.23). And he acts in his sovereignty predicting the future “so that you may know and believe me and understand that I am” (Isa 43.10; cf. 45.6). Similarly, just as the ὄνομα will be manifest (φανερὸν ἔσται) (64.2[1]) to the enemies of God and his people, so also they will come to know “that I am the Lord” (49.26).

In summary, although the ὄνομα of God refers to the covenant Name, it functions more like the “I am” expressions in polemical contexts and with eschatological significance. The divine ὄνομα functions as something of a place-holder for the concept of the divine Name. As such, it is related on the one hand to the name YHWH, while there may be a sense on the other hand in which the “I am” expressions find their ultimate expression and fulfillment in the promise of 52.6: “my people will know my name in that day.” This promise follows all the Isaianic “I am” expressions, and its eschatological orientation collects the hope expressed repeatedly (“that you may know that I am he”) and points to its realization: “therefore my people will know my name....”⁵⁸ Since John is shaped so deeply by the “I am” statements of Deutero-Isaiah, and since he thinks in conceptual clusters, it is difficult to imagine that he would not have drawn his inference *from* Isaiah that Jesus is likewise associated with the entire divine Name concept.

The Divine Name and Glory in Isaiah

It hardly needs defending that the divine Name and divine glory function quite similarly in the LXX—both grammatically and conceptually. Grammatically, the two often occur in parallel,⁵⁹ and the phrases δόξαν ὀνόματος⁶⁰ and ὄνομα δόξης⁶¹ function generally as a hendiadys for divine revelation and glorification. Conceptually, both can refer to the revelation of divine action and character, which may be why Moses’ request to see divine glory (Exod 33.19) is answered with

⁵⁸ Interestingly, Keiser argues that Isaiah was consciously dependent on Deuteronomy 32, where the “I am” expression identifies God’s exclusivity over-against other gods (v39) within a song, the “overall scope and purpose” of which is to be a “proclamation” of the divine Name. Thomas Keiser, “The Song of Moses a basis for Isaiah’s Prophecy,” *VT* 55 (2005): 487.

⁵⁹ E.g., 1 Chr 22.5; Ps 101[102].16; 1 En. 9.4.

⁶⁰ 1 Chr 16.29; Ps 78[79].9; Mic 5.3; cf. 1 Clem. 59.2.

⁶¹ Neh 9.5; Ps 71[72].19; Pss. Sol. 11.8; Dan 3.52.

an exposition of the divine Name (Exod 34.5-7). Glory language and name language function similarly in Isaiah.⁶²

a) Polemical and Eschatological Significance

In addition, glory and Name in Isaiah are featured together as a major issue at stake in the trial speeches. In Isaiah 42.8, both Name and glory express YHWH's exclusive claim to divine sovereignty: "I am the Lord God, this is my *name*; my *glory* I will not give to another." Over-against a treacherous, blind and deaf Israel, God acts for the sake of his Name, and in defense of his own glory (Isa 48.8-11). And because his Name is continually profaned among the nations, he promises to manifest it "in that day" (Isa 52.5-6). Similarly, the hope expressed that the divine Name would be manifested occurs in the context of God's rejection of his people, who do *not* call upon his Name (Isa 64.2-7[1-7]).

Furthermore, both concepts in Isaiah have *eschatological* significance. Most prominently, they summarize divine eschatological revelation. The voice of Isaiah 40.5 proclaims that, after the flattening of mountains, "the glory of the Lord will be seen, and all flesh will see the salvation of God, for the Lord spoke (ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν)." Yet in Isaiah 52.6, the same event, similarly founded on a divine pronouncement, is presented in terms of the Name: "Therefore my people shall know my name, for I am he who is speaking (ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτὸς ὁ λαλῶν)."⁶³ Isaiah 56-66 carries on the theme of eschatological glory and Name revelation (Isa 59.19; 64.2[1]; 66.19); in addition, as will be discussed further below, name language appears as the object of eschatological promise in several passages featuring a "new name" (Isa 56.5; 62.2; 65.15; cf. 66.19a). This is not exclusive to Isaiah—Name and glory revelation occurs in Ezekiel 39, and both Isaiah and Ezekiel are indebted, in part, to the themes and language of Exodus.⁶⁴ However the sustained emphasis on eschatological glory and Name in Isaiah is unparalleled.⁶⁵

⁶² E.g., grammatical parallel in Isa 24.15; 59.19; 66.19; cf. 25.1.

⁶³ Cf. Isa 55.13; 59.19; 60.9; 66.5, 19. The author of Isaiah 64.2[1] may well have read these two passages in parallel, since he appears to echo Isaiah 40.5, but features Name instead of glory: As in 40.3, a desert is the context for the prophet's petition that God "open heaven," after which he sees that the mountains will tremble and melt like wax, and fire consume God's enemies and the "Name of the Lord be manifest among them" (64.2[1]). This will happen "when you do glorious things (τὰ ἐνδοξα)" (64.3[2]).

⁶⁴ Ezekiel 39 features eschatological Name revelation (v7; cf. Isa 52.6) and glory revelation (vv. 13, 21; cf. Isa 40.5) in a context that could be characterized as polemical. In addition, both Ezekiel 39 and Isaiah 52 contrast Name-revelation with profaning the Name; Name-revelation occurs on "the day" (Ezek 39.8) or "in that day" (Isa 52.6); and it is paired with divine speech: "I am he who is speaking" (Isa 52.6) and "the day in which I have spoken" (Ezek 39.7). However the cumulative argument developed in this chapter rules this

The overlap in both polemical and eschatological significance in divine Name and glory language in Isaiah increases the plausibility that John drew upon Isaiah for his own Name concept. Since he is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for his “I am” expression and glory concept, and since both of these are intertwined with the divine Name in Isaiah, it is difficult to imagine that Isaiah’s Name concept had no impact on John. Moreover, John is all the more likely to have attended to Isaiah’s divine Name concept because, alongside divine glory, it was a central issue at stake and because it was the object of eschatological expectation. Earlier, it was suggested that John 12.41 reflects the conviction that the whole of Isaiah constituted a vision of eschatological glory, realized in Jesus. Since eschatological glory and Name are intertwined in Isaiah, John would have been inclined to interpret the Name christologically as well.

This becomes all the more plausible when it is observed that the eschatological significance of the Name in Isaiah attracted the attention of other later interpreters. One passage in the “Words of the Luminaries” contains allusions to passages in Isaiah which refer to divine glory and the divine Name, notably as objects of eschatological expectation:⁶⁶ “All the countries have seen your glory...And to your great Name they will carry their offerings....”⁶⁷ Or, one Qumran

passage out as the *primary* impetus underlying John’s divine Name concept: The combination of Name, glory, and I am language is unique to Isaiah, and only in Isaiah do Name and glory also have an associative significance. Furthermore, John is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for his glory concept and “I am” expression, whereas he never cites Ezekiel, and alludes to it perhaps only in the Shepherd discourse, which does not feature Name or glory language. I will outline reasons for why GJohn is similarly not indebted primarily to Exodus in chapter 2.

⁶⁵ References to glory in passages with an eschatological orientation are scattered and scarce: Ps 49[50].15, 23; 85[86].9, 12; Dan 12.13; Mic 1.15; 5.3; Hab 2.14; Hag 2.7, 9; Zech 2.9; Tob 13.14; Pss. Sol. 10.7, 17.30; Sir. 44.13. A notable exception is Ezekiel, with at least 5 occurrences (Ezek 39.13, 21; 43.2, 4-5; 44.4). But all these pale in comparison with Isaiah, whose sustained interest in eschatological glory is truly striking: Isa 4.2-5; 5.16; 10.16; 24.23; 28.5; 33.17; 35.2; 40.5; 44.23; 49.3; 52.13; 55.5; 58.8; 60.1-2, 7, 19, 21; 61.3; 62.2; 66.18, 19. Similarly, of the 43 occurrences of the future tense of δοξάζω in the LXX, Isaiah has more (12) than any other book (Exodus is second with 7 occurrences). More common are references to the divine Name in passages with eschatological orientation, including petitions to know the Name (1 Kgs 8.43; 2 Chr 6.33; Ps 82[83].19), and the promise that some aspect of the Name would be known or glorified (Jer 16.21; Ezek 36.23; 39.7; Zech 14.9; Pss 21[22].23; 44[45].18; 85[86].9; 101[102].16), or present in the Temple (2 Chr 7.16; 33.4, 7), and that the people of God would bear his Name (Jer 15.16; Am 9.12). But most of these concepts are gathered up in Isaiah, which is unique in its emphasis on the Name in eschatological contexts (Isa 24.15; 29.23; 43.7; 52.6; 55.13; 59.19; 60.9; 64.2[1]; 66.5, 19). Notably, the key eschatological phrase from Isaiah 1-39, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, is deployed only once in Deutero-Isaiah, for Name-revelation (Isa 52.6).

⁶⁶ This text is a “collage of scriptural quotations and allusions, with different scriptural passages frequently connected by ‘catchwords’.” James Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 242.

⁶⁷ 4Q504 frag. 1-2 col. IV.8, 10; cf. Isa 40.5; 60.9. Also, 4Q504 frags. 1-2, col. III.1-5 combines Isaiah 52.10(MT), where the divine arm is bared “before the eyes of all the nations (לְעֵינֵי כּוֹל הָעַמִּים)” with Isaiah 43.6-

passage drawing on the language of Psalm 66[67].¹ (cf. Num 6.25) may also reflect the influence of Isaiah 52.6: “And he will make his light shine upon you and make you know his great name” (4Q542 *frag 1. col I*).⁶⁸ Similarly, some later interpreters, reflecting on the eschatological hope expressed in Isaiah (particularly chs. 40-66), refer to the divine Name, perhaps precisely because it was so bound up with Isaianic eschatological expectation. For instance, *Psalms of Solomon* 11.1-8, which is saturated in the language of Isaiah,⁶⁹ concludes with the petition: “the Lord lift up Israel in the name of his glory” (v8).⁷⁰ And Isaiah 52.6 may have exerted influence on the Targumist, who renders the Name in the Targum of Isaiah 30.27, as being “revealed,” not “coming” as in the MT/LXX.⁷¹

b) Associative Significance

There is yet another reason why John may have been inclined to appropriate Isaiah’s Name and glory language for use in his own Gospel: There are hints within the text of Isaiah itself, explicated by later interpreters, that Name and glory language serves as a locus for the association of God with a distinguishable “Servant” figure. *Glory* and *name* have an “associative” significance.⁷² The following discussion will identify these hints first in the Hebrew text, observing along the way how these are drawn out by the LXX translator or subsequent interpreters.

7(MT), which says “bring my sons...everyone who is called by my name, whom I created for my glory”: “We have [in]voked only your name; for your glory you have created us; you have established us as your sons in the sight of all the peoples (לעיני כול העמים).” Text from Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 257.

⁶⁸ This combination of allusions may have been encouraged by the similarity of expression between Isaiah 52.6(MT): “therefore my people will know my name” and Psalm 67.3(MT): “so that your way may be known on the earth,” particularly as “Name” and “path” or “way” are interchangeable elsewhere (e.g., Mic 4.5).

⁶⁹ “...the voice of one bringing good news” (v1; cf. Isa 52.7); “from the east and west assembled” (v2; cf. Isa 43.5); “He flattened high mountains into level ground” (v4; cf. Isa 40.5); “Jerusalem, put on the clothes of your glory” (v7; cf. Isa 61.10).

⁷⁰ Text from “Psalms of Solomon,” trans. R. B. Wright, in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 651-670.

⁷¹ Alternatively, this may also be explained by the fact that a divine subject often acquired a revelatory verb in the Targums to avoid anthropomorphism. See Andrew Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 371.

⁷² Note that my use of “associative” here signifies a built-in duality to name and glory language itself, and should not be confused with “associative exegesis” (i.e., lexematic associations, or “catchwords”).

i. Name, Glory, and Arm

The first indication that Name and glory language in Isaiah might be a shared concept between God and his Servant is the relationship between glory and Name language and the imagery of the “Arm” of the lord. This relationship (discussed below) is suggestive because the Arm is divine, but can also be read as referring to the Servant.⁷³ Superficially, the “Arm of the Lord” simply denotes the salvific action of God himself.⁷⁴ Yet the grammatical distinction between God and his Arm⁷⁵ could be exploited to identify the Arm as the Servant figure. In the HB, God’s “arm” rules and delivers on his behalf (לְ) (Isa 40.10; 59.16; 63.5), and he even causes it to walk (מְלִיךְ) alongside Moses at the exodus (63.12). The Arm is addressed to “awake” (51.9), and is that for which the coastlands hope (51.5). The distinction between God and his Arm encourages readers to notice that the hiddenness of the Servant (49.2) anticipates the corresponding revelation of the Arm (52.10; 53.1); likewise, the gathering mission of the Servant (49.5) may suggest to readers that it is the “Arm,” not YHWH himself, who will gather lambs in 40.10-11. This striking distinction between God and his Arm is sometimes retained in the LXX,⁷⁶ and the reference to the Arm in the LXX of 53.1 appears to strengthen the identification of the Arm with the Servant.⁷⁷

⁷³ God’s “arm” (HB זְרוֹעַ and LXX ὁ βραχίων) is unusually concentrated in Isaiah 40—66 (40.10; 48.14; 51.5, 9; 52.10; 53.1; 59.16; 62.8; 63.5, 12).

⁷⁴ Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 241.

⁷⁵ E.g., Isa 40.10; 59.16; 62.8; 63.5, 12. Payne and Goldingay refer to the Arm as “virtually hypostatized.” John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40-55*, vol. 2 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 298. Similarly Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 424, 427; Lincoln, *Truth*, 50.

⁷⁶ There are some exceptions: The Arm is replaced by Jerusalem in the LXX of 51.9, and in 59.16, God himself defends merely by his arm.

⁷⁷ This identification is most explicit in 53.1-2: In the MT, the Arm is distinguished from the Servant, since it is revealed “upon (עַל)” him (similarly ἐπὶ τίνι in *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus*). However, John knows the LXX version τίνι (John 12.38). On the one hand, the “Arm” described in third person is distinguished from the Lord, who is addressed directly in the vocative (κύριε); and on the other, it is identified with the αὐτόν (i.e., Servant) in verse 2. The Arm/Servant is revealed to (τίνι) the “we” who bear witness in verse 2: εἶδομεν αὐτόν. Furthermore, note the parallel language in 51.5 (εἰς τὸν βραχίονά μου ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν) and 42.4 (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ [Servant’s] ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν). Scholars have recognized a reinterpretation of 42.1-9 in 51.4-5. See Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 253. Yet interestingly, by altering the HB plural “arms” (51.5) to “arm,” the LXX translator reflects awareness of the relationship between the texts, and perhaps brings the “Arm” into further alignment with the Servant. The similar language applied to the messianic figure in Isaiah 11.10 is surely noteworthy: ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν. Such a parallel may have generated the identification of the Servant as messiah in some rabbinic traditions (e.g., Tg. Isa. 43.10; 52.10, 13; Midr. Ps. 2.9).

This feature of Isaiah is relevant because both the Name and glory are presented alongside the Arm as the subject to which Israel is called to bear witness,⁷⁸ and as the object of eschatological revelation. The promises of eschatological glory (Isa 40.5) and divine Name revelation (Isa 52.6) should be read, not only alongside each other,⁷⁹ but both in turn alongside the promise that the Lord will reveal his Arm (Isa 52.10). In 52.6-10,⁸⁰ God's eschatological self-manifestation is expressed in two parallel statements:

v6: Therefore my people will know my name in that day...
v10: ...And the Lord will reveal his holy arm before all nations

Of course the Servant is never identified as the divine Name or glory. However, since the Arm is the Servant (52.10; 53.1), the divine Name-revelation (Isa 52.6) is paralleled with the unveiling of the Servant. Somehow, the disclosure of the divine Name occurs in or alongside the disclosure of the Servant. He is the manifestation of the divine action,⁸¹ which culminates in eschatological revelation and salvation. There is a hint here that Name and glory language could function as a nexus in which God and his Servant are associated. This suggestion is strengthened when we examine the use of these concepts in Isaiah more closely.

⁷⁸ Compare Isaiah 12.4-5 and 66.19 (cf. 43.10) with 53.1-2.

⁷⁹ Compare Isaiah 40.5, 10; 51.5-6; 52.6, 10 (cf. 26.10-13). Isaiah 40.5 should be read alongside 52.6-10. Perhaps influenced by Isaiah 52.10, the LXX inserts τὸ σωτήριον into Isaiah 40.5, creating a link between the passages and a parallelism between "glory" and "salvation." Similarly, a combination of Isaiah 52.7 and 40.4 may be reflected in *Psalms of Solomon* 11 (see n.69). See also Goldingy and Payne, *Isaiah 40-55*, 262-263. Christina Ehring, "YHWH's Return in Isaiah 40.1-11* and 52.7-10: Pre-exilic Cultic Traditions of Jerusalem and Babylonian Influence," in *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second Temple Judah*, ed. Ehud ben Zvi and Christoph Levin (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 92-94. George Brooke has argued that we must attend, not only to citations in isolation, but texts which circulated as sets/triplets etc., and tended to be read as mutually interpreting, notably in Qumran and the NT. George J. Brooke, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 56.

⁸⁰ Isaiah 52.6 should be read alongside vv.7-10: Although there is a natural break between vv.6-7 in the MT, in LXX, vv.6-8 comprise a single sentence. See Evans, "Obduracy and the Lord's Servant," 233-234. The identification of Name-revelation with Arm revelation derives from the Exodus tradition, where God exercised his Arm in order to reveal his Name (Isa 63.12).

⁸¹ E.g., Isa 42.1-7; 49.6, 9-12; 52.13-53.12.

ii. Glory as Associative

Divine glory is shared between God and his Servant. In the second so-called servant song (Isa 49.1-9a),⁸² the Servant is glorified, but is also the means by which God is glorified. This is implicit in the HB. God is honoured (פָּאָר) in the Servant (49.3), who in turn is glorified (כִּבְדָּ) before the Lord. Furthermore, if there is an allusion to the preparation for the revelation of divine glory (40.3-5) in 49.11 (“And I will turn all my mountains into a way, and my highways will be elevated”), there may be an implicit link drawn between the Servant’s role as the “light of the nations” (49.6) and the divine glory which would be revealed to “all people” (40.5). Such features may have led the LXX translator to make the sharing of glory more explicit by rendering the two Hebrew verbs as δοξάζω:⁸³

καὶ ἐν σοὶ [i.e., Servant] δοξασθήσομαι (v3)⁸⁴
δοξασθήσομαι ἐναντίον κυρίου (v5)

The same features may have influenced the author of 1 Enoch 52.6-9: This passage probably draws on Isaiah 40.3, but instead of the mountains being flattened before YHWH, they dissipate before the “Chosen One.”⁸⁵ Perhaps the association of YHWH and Servant through shared glory language in Isaiah 49 generated this interpretive move.

The glorification of the Servant in the fourth song (Isa 52.13-53.12) is also implicitly linked with divine glory: “Look, my servant...will be exalted and glorified exceedingly” (Isa 52.13). Earlier we noted the literary antecedents of this text in Isaiah 6, where God is exalted and his glory

⁸² Although some suggest a break between vv.4-5 and vv.7-8, most scholars agree that vv.1-12 or vv.1-13 constitute a unit of sorts. See Watts, *Isaiah* 34-66, 736-737.

⁸³ Brockington demonstrates the LXX translator had a preference for δόξα language. L. H. Brockington, “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in Δόξα,” *VT* 1 (1951): 23-32.

⁸⁴ An instrumental dative σοὶ (“through you”) strengthens the association here.

⁸⁵ An allusion to Isaiah 40.3 is not obvious in 1 Enoch 52.6-9. Nickelsburg and VanderKam make no mention of one. George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012). The mountains are not “made low” before divine glory as in Isaiah, but rather “will become like honeycomb (that melts) before the fire.” However, as Davis points out, 1 Enoch 52.7 echoes 1 Enoch 1.6, which is much more clearly patterned on the Isaiah passage: “Mountains and high places will fall down and be frightened. And high hills shall be made low; and they shall melt like a honeycomb before the flame.” It may be, then, that the “flame” before which the hills “melt” in both Enochic passages corresponds to the “glory” which appears in Isaiah 40.5; and both passages derive in part from Isaiah 40.3-5. It is interesting then that the mountains melt before YHWH and his mighty power in 1 Enoch 1.4, but before the Chosen One in 1 Enoch 52.6-9. Either the Chosen one has been substituted for YHWH himself, or for the “mighty power.” Davis, *Name and Way*, 77. This is similar to the profound association between YHWH and his Servant reflected in the Name, glory, and Arm language of Isaiah 40—55. All translations of 1 Enoch are taken from *1 Enoch: A New Translation*, trans. George Nickelsburg and James VanderKam (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004).

seen.⁸⁶ Although these links occur in both the HB and LXX, they are clearer in the LXX: The translator uses the passive of ὑψόω—a usage which elsewhere almost always describes the exaltation of the Lord,⁸⁷ who is also usually the object of δοξάζω.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, in both versions the language confers on the Servant “the highest hono[u]r” possible,⁸⁹ both because it is the language of exaltation, and because it associates the Servant with God. There may also be a sense, particularly in the LXX translation, in which the promised revelation of divine glory in 40.5 is realized by the nations and kings who “will see” the glorified Servant in 52.15.⁹⁰ In short, glory language functions in this passage as the nexus in which these two distinguishable figures are associated.

As with the LXX translator, reflection on the associative significance of glory language in this passage may similarly have encouraged the targumist to render the passage thus: “and [the Servant’s] brilliance will be holy brilliance, that everyone who looks at him will consider him” (Tg. Isa. 53.2).⁹¹ Similarly, it may have contributed to the striking exaltation of the figure of 4Q491c *frag.* 1: “[...] my glory is in[comparable] and besides me no one is exalted....”⁹² As the servant suffers, so this exalted figure bears sorrows and suffers evil; and his incomparable glory is reminiscent of the “very high” glory of the Servant.⁹³ So then the exclusivity of his “incomparable” glory may be reminiscent of the exclusivity of YHWH reflected throughout Isaiah 40–55.⁹⁴

John’s own glory concept should be understood in this interpretive context, in which glory language functions as a nexus in which God is associated with a distinguishable figure. It is

⁸⁶ See n.19.

⁸⁷ Isa 2.11, 17; 5.16; 12.4, 6; 30.18; 33.10; 40.25. But see occasional references to God exalting his people (4.2; 63.9).

⁸⁸ Isa 5.16; 24.23; 25.1; 33.10; 42.10; 43.23; 49.3.

⁸⁹ Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, trans., Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 396.

⁹⁰ This link between Isaiah 40 and 52 is stronger in the LXX: The translator has introduced priests in 40.2, who are called upon to speak comfort (Comfort! Comfort...) to Jerusalem and who precede the vision of glory (40.5). These priests may be associated with those bearing sacred vessels (priests?), who are commanded to depart from Jerusalem (Depart! Depart...) (52.11), and are invited to witness the glory of the Servant. See Eugene Robert Ekblad, Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 285.

⁹¹ Or perhaps “and the glory of the Holiness (שְׁדִיחַ) will be/become [the Servant’s] glory.” The same word (שְׁדִיחַ) is used earlier in the verse to refer to “the generations of the Holiness/Holy One.”

⁹² See also 4Q427 *frag* 7 col I + 9; 1QH^a XXVI top; 4Q471b. 1–3.

⁹³ See discussion in Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 272–282.

⁹⁴ E.g., Isa 42.8; 43.11; 44.6; 45.5–6, 21; 47.8, 10; 48.11.

likely the glory language in both Isaiah 6 and 52—53 that led John to juxtapose citations from these passages (John 12.38-41) in the context that features both Jesus' glorification (John 12.23) and the glorification of God's Name (12.28). Similarly, Isa 49.3-5 may well underlie the mutual glorification of Father and Son reflected in John 13.31-32 (cf. 12.23, 28; 17.1, 5). It appears that the "associative" significance of glory—more implicit in the HB and subsequently crystallized in Jewish tradition—appears also in GJohn.

iii. Name as Associative

A similar phenomenon may be observed when we turn to Isaiah's divine Name concept. Earlier we noted the implicit identification of Name revelation with the revelation of the Arm, in both the HB and LXX. Somehow, the eschatological revelation of God's Name is bound up with the disclosure of his Servant. To this we may add that, in the HB, listening to the Servant is implicitly paralleled with reliance on the divine Name. In the first song, the coastlands wait for the teaching of the Servant (42.4), whose mission in some way achieves or exemplifies the glory reserved exclusively for the divine Name (42.8). And in Isaiah 50.10, heeding the voice of the Servant is faintly paralleled with fearing the Lord and leaning on his Name:

Who among you fears the LORD, heeding the voice of his servant?
Let him who walks in dark places where there is no light
trust in the name of the LORD
and rely upon his God.

Subsequent interpreters of Isaiah, both preceding and contemporaneous with John, seem to have read name language in Isaiah as "associative," i.e., as a shared concept within which YHWH and his Servant may be associated. Beginning with the LXX translator, these interpreters drew out the associative significance of name language more explicitly, as will be demonstrated in the discussion that follows. This, in turn, demonstrates how John is likely to have regarded name language in Isaiah.

a. LXX

Recent scholarship has demonstrated that most of the changes made by the LXX translator of Isaiah reflect, not a different *Vorlage*, but the intent of the translator; notably, he exhibits an interest in drawing out or introducing connections and parallelisms in general, and sometimes clarifies the close relationship between YHWH and his Servant present already in the

HB.⁹⁵ In this context, it is relevant to the current discussion to observe that he draws out the associative significance of name language by juxtaposing God or his Name suggestively with the name of the Servant. So, for instance, he clarifies the parallel in Isaiah 50.10 noted above by altering the syntax:

Who among you fears (ὁ φοβούμενος) the Lord?
 let him listen (ἀκουσάτω) to the voice of his servant
 Those who walk (οἱ πορευόμενοι) in darkness and have no light
 trust (πεποιθήατε) on the name of the Lord
 and rely (ἀντιστηρίσασθε) on God

Isaiah 50.10LXX features two paralleled statements, “Who among you fears the Lord” and “those who walk in darkness and have no light,” followed respectively by imperatives “let him listen to the voice of his servant” and “trust in the name of the Lord.” Here, listening to the Servant’s voice is equated implicitly with trusting in the divine Name.⁹⁶ By its distinguishability from God, the Name can function here as a bridge concept between reliance on God and heeding the Servant.

More suggestively, in the first song (Isa 42.1-8),⁹⁷ instead of the HB, “the coastlands wait for [the Servant’s] law (תורה)” (42.4), the LXX translator has “on his name (ὄνομα), the Gentiles will hope.”⁹⁸ This introduces ambiguity between the name of the Servant and the divine Name in

⁹⁵ The translator adds or omits particles to clarify or create relationships in the passage, and in several instances of repeating a Hebrew word from a nearby phrase or clause, he clarifies a passage or a parallel. See Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 135, 515-516. For his role clarifying the relationship between YHWH and the Servant, see Ekblad, *Isaiah’s Servant Poems*, 283-285.

⁹⁶ By rendering the verb שמע as an unambiguous imperative ἀκουσάτω, the LXX translator more closely identifies obedience to the Servant with the imperative to trust (πεποιθήατε) “in the name of the Lord.”

⁹⁷ Many modern scholars delimit the first Song to verses 1-4. Marginal markings in the Great Isaiah Scroll appear to mark off verses 1-5 as a text of significance. Regardless, in the final form as we have it, verses 1-9 appear to constitute a single scene, including speech about the Servant, directed to the Servant, and directed to the court witnesses. See John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 2005), 647. Justin Martyr’s christological interpretation of “Name” in verse 8 depends on his reading verse 8 in the context of verses 1-8 (*Dial.* 65). And John is likely to have read verse 8 similarly in the context of the preceding verses.

⁹⁸ Here, the Göttingen critical edition has νόμος (in his law). However, in some codices and Greek versions, ὄνοματι appears instead, the influence of which may be reflected in Isaiah 11.10, which adjusts the HB “the nations will ask of him” to “the nations will hope on him.” This is the version to which Matthew had access (Matt 12.21), and 1 Clement 59.3 may allude to the same text: “...to hope on your Name, the primal source of all creation.” Joseph Ziegler has made the intriguing suggestion that Matthew first interpreted the text with ὄνοματι in Matthew 12.21, and a subsequent correction was made to the Greek manuscripts in accordance with Matthew. This would suggest that the substitution of ὄνοματι here was part of the early Christian tradition of interpretation of Isaiah 42, with which John may well have been familiar. Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster: Aschendorffschen

Isaiah 50.10 and 42.8. The phrasing used here in 42.4 is echoed in 50.10, where readers are exhorted to “trust in the name of the Lord”:

42.4: ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

50.10: πεποιθήατε ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου

This parallel, alongside several other parallels between the first and third servant songs, encourage readers to compare the two:

<u>Isaiah 42</u>	<u>Isaiah 50</u>
v1 servant (παῖς)	v10 servant (παιδός)
I have given (ἔδωκα) my Spirit	v4 Lord gives (δίδωσι) me a tongue...
I will help (ἀντιλήμψομαι) [the Servant]	vv.7, 9 The Lord was my helper (βοηθός)... he helps (βοηθεῖ) me
v2 ...nor will [the Servant's] voice be heard	v10 Let him hear the voice of his Servant!

Consequently, the divine Name and that of the Servant are suggestively juxtaposed: Whereas the nations will hope on the Servant's name (42.4), readers of 50.10 are exhorted to trust in the divine Name.⁹⁹

Similarly, within the first song itself, the juxtaposition of the Servant's name in 42.4 with the divine Name that occurs in 42.8 increases the ambiguity of relationship between the Servant and God. Already in the HB, the use of the first person and יְהוָה in verses 1 and 8 form these verses into an *inclusio*. Although God declares “[the Lord] is my name; my glory I will *not* give to another” (42.8), he *has given* or placed (יָהַר) his Spirit upon the Servant (42.1). This raises the possibility that the exclusion of the “other” in verse 8 may not apply to the Servant. The LXX translator increases this possibility by introducing the Servant's name in verse 4. As ὄνομα in the LXX of Isaiah is usually that of the Lord,¹⁰⁰ readers of LXX Isaiah may have been inclined to see here what Ekblad calls a “double-meaning.”¹⁰¹ The mission of this Servant is dependent on the divine Name; and because of the divine Name, the nations hope in the Servant's name. Conversely, by placing their hope in the Servant's name, the nations honour the divine Name. The

Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), 141. Cf. Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems*, 69. Whether this is a deliberate substitution or simply reflects a different underlying HB text cannot be established conclusively. But van der Vorm-Croughs has determined that pluses or minuses in the LXX are only rarely due to a different *Vorlage*. Van der Vorm-Croughs, *Pluses and Minuses*, 518.

⁹⁹ Interestingly, the LXX translator uses a similar expression elsewhere to feature the messianic “shoot” in 11.10 (ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν) and the divine Arm in 51.5 (καὶ εἰς τὸν βραχίονά μου ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν). See also n.77.

¹⁰⁰ Isa 12.5; 19.18; 33.21; 41.25; 42.8; 47.4; 48.2, 9, 11; 50.10; 51.15; 52.5.

¹⁰¹ Ekblad, *Isaiah's Servant Poems*, 70.

implicit juxtaposition of the two names reflects what may well have been read as a profound association of the Servant figure with the divine Name. Ekblad concludes from this that, in the LXX version, divine glory is not restricted to God alone, but in fact rests upon his Servant.¹⁰²

The LXX translator was not alone in reading the text in this way. The Targum leaves open the possibility that the people of God could share in the glory otherwise reserved exclusively for the divine Name: “my glory—that I am revealed upon you¹⁰³—I will give to no *other people*.”¹⁰⁴ Justin Martyr exploits the same ambiguity in the text when he interprets the Servant figure of Isaiah 42.6-7 in terms of the Name in 42.8: “Do you not see, O friends, that God says he will give *to this one* [τοῦτῳ] glory, whom he made a light for the nations, and not to another [ἄλλῳ τινί]; and not, as Trypho said, as if God retains glory for himself” (*Dial.* 65.7).¹⁰⁵

Another example of the LXX translator reading name language in Isaiah as associative may be seen in the reception of Isaiah 49. In the LXX, verse 1 reads: “Listen to me, islands, and pay attention, Gentiles; after a long time he/it will stand (διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ στήσεται),¹⁰⁶ says the Lord: from my mother’s womb he called my *name*.” Here, by slightly altering the Hebrew text,¹⁰⁷ the LXX translator brings this verse into alignment with the phrasing he used in Isaiah 30.27: “Look, the name of the Lord comes after a long time (διὰ χρόνου ἔρχεται πολλοῦ).”¹⁰⁸ This phrasal link, combined with the reference to the Servant’s “name” may reflect a conviction that the coming of the divine Name (30.27) was associated with the calling of the Servant’s name (49.1b).¹⁰⁹ A similar inference could be drawn from the fact that the catchwords “name,” “called,” and “glory” from this

¹⁰² Ekblad, *Isaiah’s Servant Poems*, 78-79.

¹⁰³ Or perhaps “with which I have been revealed to you.”

¹⁰⁴ Cf. “another people” in Tg. Isa. 48.11.

¹⁰⁵ My translation. Text from *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon, édition critique*, vol. 1, Philippe Bobichon (Fribourg: Academic Press Pribourg, 2003), 362. Hurtado points out that, at least from the perspective of early Christians such as John or Justin Martyr, Isaiah 42.1-8 was understood roughly in this way. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 387. Chibici-Revneanu concurs: “Das Verständnis von Jes 42,8; 48,11 war allerdings durchaus nicht unumstritten: Ist gemeint, dass Gott seine Herrlichkeit keinem anderen *außer seinem Knecht* geben will....” Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 386, n.136. Emphasis mine.

¹⁰⁶ Taking στήσεται as intransitive.

¹⁰⁷ He has altered the HB (or used an alternate *Vorlage*) from “pay attention you people *from afar* (מֵרְחוֹק)” to “pay attention you Gentiles; *after a long time* (διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ), he will stand.”

¹⁰⁸ Interestingly, a similar result obtains in Isaiah 59.19, where, as in 30.27, the divine “Name” is paralleled with the “wrath” *from* (πάρ᾽) God which “comes” (ἔρχω), and is distinguishable from God himself. But here, this distinguishability is clearer in the HB: “*He/it* [the Name?] will come...driven by the wind of the Lord.”

¹⁰⁹ Ekblad, *Isaiah’s Servant Poems*, 92.

second song occur also in Isaiah 43.7, where the Servant is presented as integral to the people of God being called by the divine Name: “All those (πάντας ὅσοι) called by my *name*; for (γάρ) in my glory I prepared him (αὐτόν, i.e., Servant in v10), and formed and made him.”

The relationship clarified by the LXX translator between the Servant and the divine Name observed above may have encouraged him to identify the divine Name with the “new name” by which the faithful “servants” of God in Isaiah 56—66 were identified. In the HB, a “new name” is given to eunuchs (56.5) to symbolize offspring (cf. 66.22); the new name כַּחֲפֹצִי (my delight is in her) is given to the people of God (62.2) to represent a new reality or identity conferred upon them;¹¹⁰ and in 65.15, a “different name” is given to the servants of YHWH. However, the LXX translator seems to attempt to identify these different or new names with each other and with the divine Name. The name in 65.15-16 is not “different,” but a “new name,” as in 62.2. And this “new name” is linked with God himself, since the sentences in which they occur are linked by γάρ: The “new” name is “blessed” (εὐλογηθήσεται) on the earth, *for* (γάρ) they will bless (εὐλογήσουσι) the true God (Isa 65.15-16). Also, the echo in the HB of 55.13 (“an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off”) in 56.5 (“an everlasting name that shall not be cut off”) is sharpened by the LXX translator: He changes the syntax of 55.13 so that it is the name κύριος which will not “fail” (οὐκ ἐκλείψει), echoed in 56.5 by the new name which likewise will not fail (οὐκ ἐκλείψει). Both adjustments may indicate an identification of the “new name” with God himself or his name, κύριος. Furthermore, they may reflect an interest in the divine Name in particular, as well as its associative significance.

b. Qumran

The LXX translator was not alone in his reading of Isaiah. Other interpreters similarly associated the Servant with YHWH in terms of name language. The author of the *Hodayot*, who derived a significant aspect of his self-image from the Servant songs, also emphasizes the Servant’s relationship to the Name.¹¹² In 1QH^a XXIII, the Servant-like role of the speaker is tied to

¹¹⁰ John Goldingay, *Isaiah 56-66* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 332.

¹¹¹ The translator brings this name into alignment with the “new (καινόν) name” of 62.2, by replacing כַּחֲפֹצִי with καινόν.

¹¹² Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 270-271. The significance of Isaiah for the Dead Sea Scrolls more generally is widely recognized. See George J. Brooke, “Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. C. C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 609-32. See also the recent study Christian Metzenthin, *Jesaja-Auslegung in Qumran* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2010), 354. The Qumran community famously identified

the revelation of the divine Name and divine glory. God entrusts “to the ea[rs of] your servant” (cf. Isa 50.4-5) his divine plan, namely, to reveal himself by his delivering hand “for your name and to show yourself mighty in [your] glo[ry].” God then “opens his mouth” so he can proclaim this (cf. Isa 49.2) “to the poor” that they may exchange “mourning” for “gladness” (cf. Isa 61.1-3).¹¹³

Similarly, the “Teacher” in 1Q28b, who is described in part using the language of Isaiah’s Servant as a “luminary [...] for the world” (*col.* IV.27) having his own “glory” (*col.* V.18), is said to be strengthened by the “holy name” of God (*col.* V.28); and he “shall glorify [God’s] name” (*col.* IV.28).¹¹⁴ Since Qumran documents exhibit sensitivity to the inner-biblical interpretation within Isaiah itself,¹¹⁵ this may represent reflection on the association of the Servant with God in terms of the divine Name implicit within Isaiah itself.

c. Songs of David

A similar connection between the Servant and the divine Name is clarified in the “Songs of David.”¹¹⁶ These songs describe God’s election of David as his servant, who, like the Isaianic

itself in light of the significant text of Isaiah 40.3. Qumran eschatology in particular was deeply shaped by the prophets, especially Isaiah. Take for instance 11Q 2.15: the time of Melchizedek’s year of favour and of vengeance is also “the day [of salvation about wh]ich [God] spoke [through the mouth of Isa]iah the prophet.”

¹¹³ Although the passage may exhibit here mere verbal correspondence to Isaiah, not allusion, it does reflect familiarity with a range of Servant-related passages in Isaiah, and possibly also the conviction that the exaltation of the divine Name and glory was at the heart of the mission of the Isaianic servant. Hughes notes that in the *Hodayot*, allusion neither requires verbal correspondence, nor is guaranteed by it. Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 45-48.

¹¹⁴ The blessing for the Teacher here draws heavily on phrases from messianic and Servant passages in Isaiah. In addition to those mentioned, he is also exalted by God “to an everlasting height” (*col.* V.23; cf. Isa 52.13); he will kill the wicked “with the breath of your lips,” and be granted a “[spirit of coun]sel and of everlasting fortitude, a spirit of knowledge and of fear of God” (*col.* V.24-25; cf. Isa 11.2, 4).

¹¹⁵ “Im Zentrum des Interesses an der innerbiblischen Schriftauslegung steht für diese Arbeit insbesondere die *innerbiblische Jesaja-Auslegung* und die Frage, ob und inwiefern diese als Vorform der Jesaja-Auslegung in den Qumranschriften zu begreifen ist.” Metzenthien, *Jesaja-Auslegung in Qumran*, 47.

¹¹⁶ Translations taken from “Songs of David,” trans. G. W. Lorein and E. van Staaldwine-Sulman, in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, vol. 1, ed. Richard Bauckham, James Davila, and Alexander Panayotov (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 264-268. These could be of Qumranic origin (perhaps influenced by 11Q5), but for some features which resemble early rabbinical material. Lorein and Staaldwine-Sulman judge the text to date from the mid first century AD, although it may be much earlier. See *ibid.*, 257-262.

Servant, is “chosen” (CšD III.7), and made “to be a light for the nations” (CšD II.8).¹¹⁷ It is noteworthy, then, that in the first song, the servant trusts in the Name (CšD I.26) and “by his mouth” God “sanctified the great Name” (CšD I.22). Moreover, he is identified with name language at several points:

All those who serve Your Name will learn a song,
those who believe the words of Your servant. (CšD I.8)

You made him inherit turban and crown with joy
and You called out his name to be praised among all nations. (CšD I.19)

...for he established Your praise up to the ends of the earth.
You established his name as a pillar of the world... (CšD I.16-17)

In the first passage, the divine Name is paralleled with the servant’s words. In the second, the servant’s name is exalted in conjunction with receiving a turban, which might recall the high priestly headpiece bearing the Name (Exod 28.36-38). And in the third passage, the servant’s name is closely paralleled with God’s own reputation.¹¹⁸ The association between the two figures in terms of name language could have been indebted, in part, to the similar use of name language in Isaianic passages, such as Isaiah 42, which has exerted some influence on these Songs, or such as Isaiah 50.10, which exhibits a parallel similar to the first above.

d. 1 Enoch

The most striking association between the Isaianic Servant and God in terms of the divine Name category occurs in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 En. 37-71).¹¹⁹ The “Chosen One” in 1

¹¹⁷ Lorein and Staaldune-Sulman indicate cross-references to several other passages from Isaiah. Ibid., 264-270. Biblical language is also drawn from Psalms (e.g., Ps 117[118].22), and 2 Samuel 7, to describe the servant.

¹¹⁸ The interplay between God’s Name and David’s name in 2 Samuel 7 may also have contributed to this.

¹¹⁹ Although the dating of 1 Enoch is still uncertain, the balance of scholarly opinion currently supports a first century date, and Jewish (not Christian) composition. See collection of essays in Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, eds., *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift* (London: T&T Clark, 2013). See also discussion in Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 58-63. Also James A. Waddell, *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios* (London; New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 22-27, esp. 22, n.56. Charlesworth even argues that John knew the text of Enoch, and polemicizes against the tradition of Enoch’s ascent in 3.13. James H. Charlesworth, “Did the Fourth Evangelist Know the Enoch Tradition?” in *Testimony and Interpretation: Early Christology in Its Judeo-Hellenistic Milieu*, ed. Jiří Mrázek and Jan Roskovec (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 223-239. However, the polemic in 3.13 could equally be against traditions of heavenly ascent featuring Moses or visionary mystics. And there may be evidence of Christian

Enoch, who is based in part on the Isaianic Servant, is identified with glory language and the divine Name. As in Isaiah, so in 1 Enoch, glory/glorification language is applied both to God and to the “Chosen One.”¹²⁰ And frequent reference is made throughout the *Similitudes* to the divine Name,¹²¹ which seems to be identified with the Chosen One in certain passages. For instance, in 1 Enoch 46.5, the kings and mighty ones are judged “because they do not exalt or praise him [son of man],” and in the next verse “because they do not exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits.” The parallel language is striking in its suggestion. Similarly, in 1 Enoch 61.3, it is said of the righteous that they will “rely on the name of the Lord of Spirits forever” so that “they may return and rely on the day of the Chosen One” (61.5). In 1 Enoch 48, the Chosen one is named before Creation (48.2-3); and prostration before¹²² the Chosen One is juxtaposed with the glorification of the Name, as if to suggest the two are inseparable activities (48.5).¹²³ A similar association is suggested in the salvation promise two verses later: “in *his* name they are saved” (48.7). The name here may be the divine Name referred to in the preceding clause, or it may be the name of the Chosen One. The ambiguity may be intended.¹²⁴ In 1 Enoch 55.4, the “son of man” figure will reign and judge “in the name of the Lord of Spirits.” And thus, in response to his judgment, the holy ones all glorify “the name of the Lord of Spirits” (61.9). Finally, there is an interesting juxtaposition of two names in 1 Enoch 69: Reference is made to a secret Name, i.e., the divine Name,¹²⁵ as well as to the unveiling

influence in 1 Enoch, such as in the association of the son of man with the messiah (48.2-3), which is absent from, e.g., Qumran. However, at the least, 1 Enoch reflects ideas with which John may well have been familiar.

¹²⁰ See 1 En. 45.3; 47.3; 49.2; 50.1, 4; 51.3; 55.4; 60.2; 61.8-12; 62.2-6; 63.7; 69.24-29.

¹²¹ Reference is made to the “name of the Lord” (1 En. 39.13; 41.8; 67.3), “my glorious name” (45.3), “his great name” (55.2), “the name of the eternal Lord” (58.4), “your blessed name,” “your name” (61.11-12), and the “name of the Lord of Spirits,” which likely has the same referent, since it is “praised” by the righteous (1 En. 39.7) and denied by sinners (1 En. 38.2) (Also 1 En. 39.9, 14; 40.4, 6; 41.2, 8; 43.4; 45.1-3; 46.7; 47.2; 48.7, 10; 50.2-3; 53.6; 55.4; 61.3, 9, 11, 13; 63.7; 67.8).

¹²² The same phrase “worship/prostrate before” is used of God in 57.3.

¹²³ One variant makes this association stronger yet: They will “worship before [the Chosen One]. They shall glorify, bless, and sing *to him, to the Name*.” See “1 Enoch,” trans. E. Isaac, in *OTP*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 35, n.E.

¹²⁴ Equally ambiguous is the referent of “name” in the same expression (“saved in his name”) in 1 Enoch 50.3. Nickelsburg and VanderKam give little attention to this, interpreting both as references to the divine Name. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 174, 182. But Waddell acknowledges that in context, these expressions indicate, at least, that “salvation is one of the functions of the messiah figure.” Waddell, *The Messiah*, 89.

¹²⁵ So Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 76. Cf. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 306-307. The “secret” name in 69.14 could simply be the name of the son of man, “revealed” in 69.26. However, in the

of the name of the son of man (69.26).¹²⁶ The secrecy of both names associates the figures to whom they belong.

Gieschen argues that the identification of the Chosen One with the divine Name in the *Similitudes* should be understood in the context of Jewish traditions that exhibited considerable interest in a theophanic figure, distinguishable from God, who was identified *as* the divine Name.¹²⁷ Commenting on 48.5, he proposes: “They will use the name of the Lord of the Spirits in worshipping the Son of Man because *both* possess the same Divine Name.”¹²⁸ Thus he suggests that the two names in 1 Enoch 69 are identical; the name of the Chosen One is revealed to be the divine Name.¹²⁹ Taking his cue from Gieschen, Waddell proposes that the secret name is simply “an epithet for the messiah figure,” or that the son of man is identified with the divine Name.¹³⁰

Gieschen and Waddell may be guilty of stretching the text. Nowhere is the figure identified *as* the Name, or the Name explicitly given to him. Rather, the author uses the Name category more subtly to encourage his readers to associate the figures to whom the name(s) belong: God and the Chosen One. This is precisely the pattern observed earlier in Isaiah. Moreover, there are some indications that the author of 1 Enoch is indebted to Isaiah particularly for his Name concept. Scholars are generally agreed that, in addition to OT traditions of the Messiah, the Danielic son of man, and pre-existent heavenly wisdom, the Enochic “Chosen One” is based on the Isaianic Servant.¹³¹ More to the point, two Enochic passages which highlight the ambiguity between the divine Name and the Chosen One are particularly indebted to Isaiah: 1 Enoch 62—63, and 48—49.

context of ubiquitous references to the divine Name throughout 1 Enoch (cf. n.121), and 55.2, where God swears by his great Name, the secret name with an oath in 69.14 is most likely the divine Name. 3 Enoch 13 likely clarifies this interpretation, with its reference to the letters by which the heavens were made (i.e., the Tetragrammaton).

¹²⁶ Although there is some debate about the unity of 1 Enoch 69, the various suggestions create as many difficulties as they solve. See Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 313-314. For the sake of discussion, then, we interact here solely with the final form of 1 Enoch 69 as it currently stands.

¹²⁷ Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man,” 242-249.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 240.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 241-242.

¹³⁰ Waddell, *The Messiah*, 74. This leads him to infer, for instance, that all the worship given to the “name of the Lord of Spirits” means worship directed to the Messiah/Chosen figure. *Ibid.*, 98

¹³¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 44, 116-117. Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 263, n.25. Gieschen, “The Name of the Son of Man,” 240. Blenkinsopp rightly cautions that dependence is clearest in his role as “light to the nations” (1 En. 48.4; cf. Isa 42.6; 49.6). But the title “Chosen One” itself likely derives from the Servant songs (Compare Isa 42.1; 49.7 and 1 En. 49.3-4; 48.1-7).

In 1 Enoch 62—63, the “mighty and the kings who possess the earth” (63.1; cf. 62.1) have failed to glorify the divine Name (63.7), but “on that day” (62.3, 8) they will “see and recognize that [the Chosen One] sits on the throne of his glory” (62.1-63.12). The passage is reminiscent of Isaiah 52, where the divine Name is despised, but will be made known “in that day” (52.5-6), and where the “kings” “shut their mouths” at the presentation of the Servant (52.15). Perhaps, then, Isaiah’s implicit identification of the Servant with the Name generated the similar association in 1 Enoch 63.7: “For in his (i.e., Chosen One) presence we did not make confession nor did we glorify the name of the Lord of the kings.”¹³²

Similarly, since the presentation of the Chosen One in 1 Enoch 48—49 is, in part, an interpretation of the second Servant song,¹³³ the naming of the Chosen One in the presence of God (1 En. 48.2-3) may represent an interpretation of Isaiah 49.1: “Before birth, the Lord called me; when I was in the womb of my mother, he recalled my name.” If so, then the author of 1 Enoch has re-framed this event to suggest that the name of the Chosen One, and perhaps the figure himself, is pre-existent: “Even before the sun and the constellations were created, before the stars of heaven were made, his name was named [lit. “named by the name”] before the Lord of Spirits” (1 En. 48.3).¹³⁴ Of course, this expression may simply connote divine foreknowledge. However, the author seems to have a particular name in view here that symbolizes a bestowal of authority or vocation—perhaps the name by which people are saved in 1 Enoch 48.7. The increased emphasis on the naming of the “Chosen One” in 1 Enoch is not likely due to other influences such as Daniel 7 or Psalm 2, where the Name does not feature at all. Rather, it is more likely to have been inspired in part by the implicit association of God and his Servant through glory and Name language in Isaiah. The author of 1 Enoch has seen in the Servant-naming of Isaiah 49 an

¹³² VanderKam and Nickelsburg argue that, like Wisdom 4—5, 1 Enoch 62—63 is a traditional interpretation of Isaiah 52.13-53.12. For instance, the rulers’ confession of sins, as a reversal of what they had denied previously, corresponds to the confession of Isaiah 53.1-6. See discussion in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 258-268. Interestingly, like John, the author of 1 Enoch combines OT passages in such interpretive texts. So for instance, 1 Enoch 62.4-5, 10 is influenced by Isaiah 13.8, and Isaiah 49.7 contributes to 1 Enoch 62.3-5.

¹³³ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 171-174. Like the Servant, the Chosen One is “hidden” (1 En. 48.6; Isa 49.2, 7), he is commissioned as a “light to the nations” (1 En. 48.4; Isa 49.6), and he is simultaneously revered and the means of God’s glorification: “All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before [the Chosen One], and they will glorify and bless and sing hymns to the name of the Lord of Spirits” (1 En. 48.5; cf. Isa 49.5, 7).

¹³⁴ Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch* 2, 170-173. Cf. Gieschen “The Name of the Son of Man,” 240.

additional significance, which suits his broader aim of legitimating the authority of the figure presented as the agent of eschatological judgment.¹³⁵

Less directly, Isaiah's associative Name concept could account for the striking association of the son of man figure with the divine Name in 1 Enoch 69. The revelation of the name of the son of man is a cipher for the revelation of the figure himself, described in 1 Enoch 62—63. In that passage, God commands the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who possess the earth "Open your eyes and lift up your horns, if you are able to recognize the Chosen One," and then seats him on a throne of glory (1 En. 62.1). Shortly thereafter, the shamed rulers

...will see and recognize that he sits on the throne of his glory...who was hidden. For from the beginning, the son of man was hidden, and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might, and he revealed him to the chosen" (1 En. 62.3, 6-7).

Similarly, the Chosen One appears to be identified as one of the deep and numberless "secrets" of God (63.3), which the rulers regret not having recognized until too late (63.4-12). These texts echo Isaiah 52.13-53.6, where those who look on, including kings, are potentially blind to the revealed Servant. It may be then that the close relationship between the revelation of the Servant and of the divine Name in Isaiah 52—53 (52.6, 10; 53.1) encouraged the author of 1 Enoch to describe the eschatological revelation of the Chosen One in the language of name-revelation, and with reference to the divine Name. In summary, the author of 1 Enoch has engaged directly with passages in Isaiah which feature the Servant and glory and name language, and the associative and eschatological significance of name language in 1 Enoch bears striking correspondence to Isaiah's divine Name concept.

e. Christian Texts

In addition to the interpretations of Isaiah reflected in the LXX, Qumran, the *Songs of David*, and in 1 Enoch, there may be hints that early Christian interpreters of Isaiah contemporaneous with John were reading Isaiah's name concept as associative. In the hymn in Philippians 2, Paul alludes to Isaiah 45,¹³⁶ but with a striking alteration that may represent his

¹³⁵ A more explicit identification of Servant with Name occurs in a later rabbinic text, in which the kings in Isaiah 49.7 see the Servant and arise to prostrate themselves *because he is inscribed with the divine Name* (Midr. Exod 15.17).

¹³⁶ It is plausible that Paul and John read the same passages in Isaiah. With the exception of Psalm 81[82].6 in John 10.34, all of John's explicit OT citations are taken from passages cited elsewhere in the NT. Thus, Menken concludes: "...John's selection of quotations (coming almost exclusively from the Later Prophets and the Psalms) is generally governed by tradition...John derived a large part of his quotations

reflection on the wider context of glory and name language in Isaiah:

<u>Isaiah 45.23</u>	<u>Philippians 2.10-11</u>
ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ	ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ
καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα	πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη
τῷ θεῷ	ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων
	καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται
	ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
	εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς.

Paul legitimates his application to Jesus of homage paid exclusively to God in Isaiah 45.23 by the audacious claim that Jesus has been given the exalted Name (Phil 2.9). It is likely that Paul recognized two distinguishable figures in Isaiah 45: God and the Lord. But he also appears to have read this passage in the context of some of the Servant songs. The exaltation of Jesus described in Philippians 2.9 (ὑπερύψωσεν) may have been inspired by Isaiah 52.13: ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.¹³⁷ Similarly, as the exclusivity of Isaiah 45.22 (“I am God, and there is no other”) echoes Isaiah 42.8 (“I am the Lord God; this is my name; my glory I will not give to another”), the “Name” and “giving” language of the latter text may have facilitated the Pauline formulation “he gave him the Name.” If, he may have surmised, the exclusively divine glory of Isaiah 42.8 was conferred on the Servant (Isa 52.13), why not also the divine Name?

A similar hermeneutic may undergird Romans 10.13-15, where Paul declares that the promise of Joel 2.32[3.5] (“all who call on the name of the Lord will be saved”) is now open to Jew and Gentile alike. However, calling on this Name depends upon proclaiming *him*, i.e., Jesus. For Paul, this proclamation is, on the one hand, the good news of Isaiah 52.7 (Rom 10.15), and on the other, identified with naming (ὀνομάζω) Christ (Rom 15.20). It seems, then, that Paul connected “good news” with the disclosure of the *name* on which the nations call in Romans 10. Most likely, Paul read verses 6 and 7 in Isaiah 52 together: The good news proclaimed is the manifestation of the divine Name, which for Paul entails Christ in a profound sense. It is only those who know the divine Name who may then call upon it.¹³⁸ Since “everyone” calls on this Name for salvation, it

from portions of what C. H. Dodd has called ‘the bible of the early Church’...[This] means that he is rooted, with all the singularity he may have possessed, in an early Christian tradition of reading and interpreting the OT.” Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 212.

¹³⁷ Ralph P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 241.

¹³⁸ Mark A. Seifrid, “Romans,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 613, 661. Paul is clearly aware of the broader context of Isaiah 52. He interprets the ramifications of Jewish sin in light of Isaiah 52.5: “For

may be that the identification of name language with the Servant in the context of eschatological salvation in Isaiah encouraged this interpretation.

Parts of the *Ascension of Isaiah* represent an early Christian interpretation of Isaiah 6, likely dating from the early second century.¹³⁹ Interestingly, the author appears to have engaged with the conceptual cluster of “I am,” glory, and Name outlined earlier. The vision features the glory of the Father (“the Great Glory”), who is flanked by the Son and Spirit (9.27-10.2). The “I am” expression from Isaiah may have influenced the presentation of the *angelus interpretes*, who tells Isaiah that, when he is raised up, “then you will understand who I am” (7.3-4; cf. Isa 43.10).¹⁴⁰ And the author exhibits interest in both the divine Name and the Son’s name, which are both described as unknown, or undisclosed, and implicitly associated: “...where the One who is not named dwells, and his Chosen One, whose name is unknown (8.7; cf. 7.37; 9.5, 26).¹⁴¹ The hiddenness of the name of the “Chosen One” is reminiscent of passages in 1 Enoch, which it was noted above may represent, in part, reflection on Isaiah 49.1. The *Ascension* may draw upon the same interpretive tradition. And perhaps the interest in the names of both God and “Beloved,” reflects the influence of Isaiah’s associative Name concept.

Finally, there are indications in the wider Johannine corpus of engagement with Isaiah in the presentation of Jesus in terms of the divine Name. For instance, there is a striking parallel between the Targum of Isaiah 43.25 and 1 John 2.12:

Tg. Isa. 43.25: “forgiveness on account of my [i.e. God’s] name”
1 John 2.12: “your sins are forgiven on account of his [i.e., Jesus’] name.”¹⁴²

If the author of the epistle is alluding to Isaiah 43 here, he has replaced God’s Name with Jesus’ name, which may represent his conviction that the text warranted the sharing of the Name concept between God and his Servant. More significantly, the author of Revelation seems to have

because of you, the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles, as it is written” (Rom 2.24). He also cites Isaiah 53.1 (Rom 10.16) and Isaiah 52.15 (Rom 15.21).

¹³⁹ See Darrell D. Hannah “Isaiah’s Vision in the *Ascension of Isaiah* and the Early Church,” *JTS* 50 (1999), 84-89. English translations from “Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah,” trans. M. A. Knibb, in *OTP*, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 156-176.

¹⁴⁰ Similarly, the Christian interpolation to the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* (3.13-4.22) likely alludes to the “I am” parody expression of Isaiah 47.10: “...[he] will say ‘I am the Lord, and before me there was no one’” (Mart. Asc. Isa. 4.6).

¹⁴¹ Perhaps the Christian interpolation to the *Martyrdom* implicitly identifies the “coming of the Beloved” (i.e., Jesus) (3.13) with the divine Name, which “has not been transmitted to this world” (1.7).

¹⁴² Ronning, “The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature,” 247-251.

associated the divine Name with the “new name” in Isaiah 56—66, which is borne by Jesus and also identifies believers (e.g., Rev 3.12). Revelation will be discussed in relation to GJohn in the chapters which follow.

In the foregoing discussion, it has been argued that, since John demonstrably thinks in terms of thematic clusters, he is likely to have regarded the divine Name as intertwined on the one hand with the “I am” expression in Isaiah, and on the other hand with divine glory. Both the Name and “I am” expression in Isaiah have a polemical function and eschatological significance; and both divine Name and glory have a polemical function, as well as eschatological and associative significance. Indeed, passages featuring the eschatological revelation of divine glory and the divine Name (notably Isa 40.5, 52.6-10) were typically read together.¹⁴³ Therefore, since John is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for his “I am” sayings and “glory” concept, it is plausible that Isaiah’s Name concept likewise generated John’s *interest* in the divine Name. Moreover, the eschatological significance of the Name, as well as its potential use in associating God with a distinguishable figure, such as Jesus, would have rendered Isaiah’s Name concept particularly appealing. There are indications that John’s contemporaries were drawn to the Name concept in Isaiah, and read it as having associative significance. The earliest readers of Isaiah—including those behind the LXX, various Qumran texts, 1 Enoch, and rabbinic and early Christian texts—recognized and at times clarified the implicit association between God and a distinguishable Servant figure through glory and name language.

Isaiah’s Name Cluster in GJohn

The plausibility of John’s indebtedness to Isaiah’s divine Name concept increases when we observe that Isaiah’s entire Name cluster—with the implied referent YHWH/κύριος and “I am” sayings on the one hand, and divine glory on the other—is replicated in the Gospel.

As in Isaiah, so in GJohn, references to the divine ὄνομα most likely draw upon the covenant Name, i.e., κύριος. Although some have suggested that the “Name” in view here is another term which appears in the Gospel, such as “Father”¹⁴⁴ or the expression “I am,”¹⁴⁵ it is unlikely that a reference to the Father’s ὄνομα in a first century Jewish document could have been

¹⁴³ See n.79.

¹⁴⁴ McPolin, “The Name,” 33.

¹⁴⁵ Brown, II: 756.

understood as anything other than the covenant Name “YHWH” (יהוה/κύριος). This is confirmed by the Gospel itself: The expression “I have come in my Father’s name” in 5.43 is most likely a Johannine reformulation of the crowd’s acclamation in 12.13: “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord (κύριος).” And, although most references to Jesus as κύριος in the Gospel are rightly rendered with the mundane translation “sir,” its occurrence in combination with θεός in Thomas’ confession, “my Lord and my God” can only represent the Greek translation of YHWH and *Elohim* (respectively).¹⁴⁶ Thus κύριος is the implied referent of the Name given to Jesus, and which he claims to have revealed to his followers in chapter 17.

Yet, as in Isaiah and indeed in wider Jewish literature, the significance of the divine ὄνομα in GJohn goes well beyond a mere reference to the covenant Name, YHWH. As in Isaiah, ὄνομα functions in GJohn in some ways more like the non-predicative “I am” expressions¹⁴⁷ than like the covenant Name. The Jews clearly regard Jesus’ claim “I am” to be blasphemous, and in some way encroaching on the exclusivity of the God whose Name was not to be profaned (John 8.58-59; cf. Exod 20.2). In addition, Jesus describes both the claim “I am” and the divine Name as the object of future revealed knowledge: Jesus promises his disciples that when his word is fulfilled they “may believe that I am” (13.19; cf. 8.28), and in 17.26 says “I made known your name to them, and I will make it known.” Furthermore, as in Isaiah, both occur in polemical contexts: The issue being controverted in chapter 5 is Jesus’ relation to the Father, expressed in 5.43 in terms of the Name: “I have come in the name of my Father, and you do not receive me.” And in 8.58 the same issue is cast in terms of the “I am” expression: “Before Abraham was born, I am.” As argued earlier, the function of the “I am” expression in GJohn as a “succinct expression of YHWH’s uncontested claim to exclusive divinity”¹⁴⁸ is indebted largely to Isaiah. It is likely that John read “I am” and Name language in Isaiah together, and may have intended to legitimate Jesus’ otherwise blasphemous use of the exclusively divine self-designation “I am” by noting that Jesus is given the divine Name (17.11).

Likewise, as in Isaiah, so in GJohn, glory and divine Name language are intertwined. Of the eight references to the divine Name in GJohn,¹⁴⁹ six appear in conjunction with glory—both divine glory and Jesus’ glory. In 5.43, “accepting” the one who comes “in the Name” is paralleled

¹⁴⁶ See Rev 4.11; Ps 34[35].23. Brown, II: 1047.

¹⁴⁷ John 4.26; 6.20; 8.24, 28, 58; 13.19; 18.5-8.

¹⁴⁸ Williams, *I Am He*, 304. Cf. Harner, *I Am*, 7-12.

¹⁴⁹ John 5.43; 10.25; 12.13, 28; 17.6, 11-12, 26.

with seeking the glory that comes from God. In John 12, both Father and Son are identified with the glorification of the divine Name (12.28; cf. 12.23; 17.1). And in John 17, Jesus claims “I glorified you on earth” and “I have made your name known” (vv.4, 6); he is given the divine Name (vv.11-12) and divine glory (v.22);¹⁵⁰ and his desire for believers to see his own glory is paired with his promise to manifest the divine Name (vv.24, 26).¹⁵¹ In addition, both concepts function similarly as the object of revelation (2.11; 17.6) and indeed as central to Jesus’ revelatory mission (1.14; 12.28; 17.4, 6). Furthermore, as in Isaiah, both the divine Name and glory are featured as the primary issue at stake in a forensic framework: In GJohn, the trial motif that frames Jesus’ public mission¹⁵² features charges of blasphemy which are juxtaposed ironically with Jesus’ tireless claim to have concern only for the work, will, and glory of the Father, which he makes clear in the petition of John 12.28: “Glorify your Name!”¹⁵³ It is also interesting to note that, just as the divine Arm is included in Isaiah alongside Name and glory to designate eschatological divine revelation, so Jesus is explicitly identified as the Isaianic Arm in the citation of Isaiah 53.1 in John 12.38 just after his own glorification is identified with the glorification of the Name (12.23, 28) and just before he is identified with divine glory (12.41).¹⁵⁴ Since John’s glory and Arm language and “I am” expression derive principally from Isaiah, and these are bound up with Name in Isaiah, it follows that John’s divine Name concept likewise is indebted to Isaiah.

¹⁵⁰ Note the parallel relative clauses $\hat{\omega}\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\omicron\iota$ (v.11) and $\eta\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\omicron\iota$ (v.22).

¹⁵¹ Jesus received his glory out of divine love, but believers come to know that love through Name revelation. This subtle interchange of Name and glory categories is only possible if John viewed them as a conceptual set.

¹⁵² Many scholars have recognized a broad-sweeping forensic motif in GJohn. See, e.g., Josef Blank, *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964). Johannes Beutler, *Martyria: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Zeugnisthema bei Johannes* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1972). Anthony E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1976). Parsenios argues that “seeking” language is also forensic: “the Jews sought then even more to kill him” (5.18; also 7.1, 11, 19, 20, 25, 30, 34; 8.37, 40; 10.39; 11.8, 56; 18.4, 7, 8). George L. Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 58-59.

¹⁵³ Andrew Lincoln has argued persuasively that Isaiah’s forensic framework constitutes the primary background for the trial motif in GJohn. Lincoln, *Truth*, 38-54. Parsenios regards his link between the forensic function of “seeking” language in GJohn and *Oedipus Rex* as mere supplement to the larger Isaianic background. Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama*, 45. Of many parallel features, Lincoln notes that in both trials, God’s glory and Name are the primary issue at stake (Isa 42.8; 48.11; 52.6; John 12.28). Lincoln, *Truth*, 48, 188-189.

¹⁵⁴ See n.12, 77.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that John was indebted primarily to Isaiah for his interest in the divine Name. First, Isaiah plays a crucial role in John's narrative, and John would likely have regarded references to the divine Name in Isaiah as part of the prophet's witness to Christ. Second, John is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for his glory motif and "I am" sayings; and he explicitly identifies Jesus with Isaiah's vision of glory and of the divine Arm (12.38, 41)—two concepts whose eschatological significance likely appealed to John's conviction that Jesus is the ultimate and climactic revelation of God. Third, it is probable that John would have considered the divine Name in Isaiah within the same conceptual cluster alongside the "I am" sayings and divine glory, and furthermore that he would have regarded Name, glory (and the divine Arm) as having eschatological and associative significance. John's contemporaries, as represented, e.g., in Qumran and the *Similitudes*, were engaged in a similar appropriation of Isaianic categories. Thus, as Young put it, "While [John] came to Isaiah with his Christology he came to it via a type of interpretation which had become a modus for reading the prophet."¹⁵⁵ Fourth, Isaiah's thematic cluster of "I am," glory, Arm, and divine Name is replicated in GJohn in striking ways. The contention here is not that John is indebted *exclusively* to Isaiah. Earlier it was noted that similar themes occur in Ezekiel 39, as they also do in the Exodus narrative. However, taken together, these points combine in a cumulative case for concluding that John was indebted in particular to Isaiah for his interest in the divine Name.

This is not to say that John has simply transcribed Isaiah's Name concept. However, Isaiah was the primary *impetus* for John's interest in a concept, which he then developed to suit his unique Christology. It follows that it was the particular significance of the divine Name in Isaiah that attracted John's interest to begin with. I have argued that John regarded Isaiah's divine Name as embedded in a thematic cluster alongside the "I am" expression and divine glory in which the divine Name is (1) the issue at stake in the trial speeches, and (2) the object of eschatological expectation, and (3) the locus of association between God and his Servant. I propose that it is precisely these features of the divine Name that drew John's interest, because they furnished him with a profound way of articulating the relationship between Jesus and the Father.¹⁵⁶ As Hurtado proposes:

¹⁵⁵ Young, "A Study," 231.

¹⁵⁶ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 385.

[T]he servant and other features of the Isaiah passages were combined to refer to Jesus in such a way that they confirmed early Christian views of him sharing in divine status and worthy of worship, and. . .this reading of Isaiah facilitated the first-century Christian effort to articulate those views in biblical vocabulary and conceptual categories.¹⁵⁷

Isaiah's Name concept furnished John with an ideal category for presenting Jesus as the object of eschatological expectation by locating him within divine categories, without falling prey to charges of blasphemy in the polemical climate of the Fourth Gospel. John was not interested in mystical or philosophical speculation surrounding the identity of Jesus. Rather, he was convinced that the event of Jesus embodied the eschatological manifestation of God. As such, the convergence of eschatological and associative significance in the highest categories of Jewish expression available—divine Name and glory—facilitated the christological effort represented by his Gospel. To determine whether this proposal has merit, we will turn to an examination of the expressions in GJohn in which the divine Name occurs to identify the significance of the Name for John in those contexts.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 381.

Part II: Exegesis of Divine Name Expressions in GJohn

In chapter 1, I argued that John is likely indebted primarily to Isaiah for his interest in the divine Name concept. John's conviction that Jesus embodied the ultimate eschatological divine revelation combined with the associative significance of certain concepts in Isaiah—the divine Arm, divine glory, and the divine Name—led him to present Jesus in these categories. In so doing, John could accord Jesus the highest possible honour, yet within a primarily theo-centric framework. In the remaining chapters, I will turn to GJohn to consider the expressions in which the divine Name explicitly appears, beginning with Name-glorification (12.28) and Name-revelation (17.6, 26).

The aim of these chapters is to determine the features that attracted John to the divine Name category. To do so, I will first isolate the “significance” of the divine Name for John from its meaning and function. I will argue that the significance is primarily associative (i.e., has a built-in duality that allows for the association of two distinguishable figures), and eschatological (i.e., an object of eschatological expectation which, from John's perspective, is both realized and yet future). The two go hand in hand: Jesus can be identified with anticipated divine Name-revelation because the Name category is associative; and because Jesus is identified with eschatological revelation, he is associated with the Father whose Name would be disclosed “in that day.” Second, I will compare the significance accorded the divine Name in GJohn with various possible backgrounds to his Name concept. I will argue that, although John's Name concept has unique features, and is indebted to a variety of influences at the level of meaning and function, its eschatological and associative significance corresponds roughly to the divine Name in Isaiah, as outlined in chapter 1. This supports the conclusion that certain passages in Isaiah were a key impetus in suggesting to John the importance of the divine Name for use in his own Gospel.

Chapter 2: Name Glorification and Revelation

The present chapter will focus on the references to the glorification (12.28) and revelation (17.6, 26) of the divine Name. These are taken together because, as will be demonstrated, John seems to have regarded these expressions as closely related to each another.

John 12.28

Function

To isolate the function of the Name within Jesus' petition, "Father, glorify your Name" (12.28), we must attend to the surrounding context. Jesus' petition occurs at the climax of Jesus' public ministry, and marks the arrival of eschatological expectation. In chapter 1, it was observed that Jesus' entire mission is framed by the wilderness voice of John the Baptizer, making straight the "way" for the eschatological universal vision of glory (1.23; cf. Isa 40.3-5). The acclamation of the crowd at Jesus' arrival, "blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord" (12.13) evokes the broader theme of Jesus' coming into the world (cf. 5.43; 16.28) on this "way." The climactic significance of this scene is further highlighted by the coming of Greeks to "see Jesus" (12.20), who for John, function as a narrative cipher for the whole "world" gone after Jesus (12.19), and "all" who behold the revelation of divine glory (cf. Isa 40.5).¹ This is why Jesus regards their coming as marking the arrival of his long-awaited (see 2.4; 7.30; 8.20) "hour" (12.23, 27) that marks the era of "true worship" (4.21, 23) and the day of eschatological judgment and resurrection (5.25-29; 12.31).² This eschatological hour marks the climax of Jesus' "day" anticipated by Abraham (8.56), and written about by Moses (5.46-47), and it features the disclosure of his glory that Isaiah saw (12.23, 41).

¹ Beutler regards the "Greeks" (12.20) as representative of the "whole world" in 12.19. Johannes Beutler, "Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12.20f)," *Biblica* 71 (1990): 343. For Jörg Frey, the "Greeks" function as a cipher for the future believers referred to in 12.32. Jörg Frey, "Heiden - Griechen - Gotteskinder: Zu Gestalt und Funktion der Rede von den Heiden im 4. Evangelium," in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*, ed. Reinhard Feldmeier and Ulrich Heckel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 256, 263. I see no reason why both statements cannot be true.

² John also conceives of a final eschatological judgment (see 5.29; 12.48). Jörg Frey, "Eschatology in the Johannine Circle," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 76-82. However, the course of that judgment is set and established by Jesus' coming and corresponding response of people to him (3.18; 5.24; 12.48). Therefore, the crisis created by Jesus' coming acquires some of the eschatological significance of final judgment.

With the arrival of Jesus' hour also comes an expectation that the radical claims made for Jesus will be legitimated. In earlier polemical discourses with the "Jews," Jesus had promised that, in the "hour," his authority over life and death would be demonstrated: "[T]he dead will hear the voice of the son of God" (5.25). And in his exaltation, his identity would be disclosed: "[T]hen you will know that I am" (8.28). It follows that, for John, the arrival of Jesus' hour would have a polemical function, to legitimate Jesus and the claims made for him over-against his opponents. This dimension is highlighted by the theophanic voice, which responds to Jesus' petition in 12.28, thereby testifying before the crowd to Jesus (12.30; cf. 5.37),³ and perhaps consequently alerting Jesus that the time of vindication of his authority to judge was "now" (12.31; cf. 5.25-29).

In the eschatologically and polemically significant context of John 12, Jesus prays, "Father, glorify *your name*" (12.28). John emphasizes the importance of this petition by bracketing it on the one hand with Jesus' comment, "It is for this reason I came to this hour" (12.27), and on the other with the single theophanic appearance on the stage of John's narrative: "Then a voice came from heaven, 'I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again' " (12.28). For John, the divine Name stands at the heart of the glorification for which Jesus came and to which his mission leads.⁴ In this, John identifies Jesus' entire mission with the highest category available to him—the glorification of the divine Name. Jesus' coming is fundamentally about the divine Name. Consequently, John legitimates the claims made for Jesus in the preceding polemical discourses. In short, the Name here functions polemically to legitimate Jesus and his mission.

Meaning

But what does the divine Name *mean* within the expression of 12.28? There is both a personal and a temporal dimension to the meaning of the Name here. First, by placing the Name here in the context of glorification language, John identifies the Name with both Jesus and the Father. On the one hand, the Father's Name signals the Father himself. Since Jesus seeks only the Father's glory, (7.18), his petition for the glorification of the Name fits in with the broader emphasis on the glorification of the *Father* (13.31-32; 14.13; 15.8; 17.4; 21.9). However, this is

³ John 12.28-29 may illustrate 5.37, both as the "most overt instance of divine testimony" in the Gospel, and in the depiction of failure to hear God's voice (5.37). Rodney Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 90-91.

⁴ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 96.

incomplete, since, excluding 12.28, the Father never explicitly glorifies himself in GJohn.⁵ On the other hand, the Name here is inextricably bound up with Jesus himself. Both the divine Name and the Son are “glorified” (δοξάζω) at the arrival of the “hour” (12.23, 27-28) and so implicitly identified with each other. Indeed, the Father who “glorifies” his own Name (12.28) also glorifies the Son (8.50, 54), and the exaltation of the Son results, both in the glorification of the Name, and in all people being drawn to Jesus (12.32).⁶ Similarly, by repeating the petition of 12.28 in 17.1 verbatim, but with τὸν υἱὸν substituted for τὸ ὄνομα,⁷ John generates ambiguity over the meaning of “Name,” and its relationship to the Son.⁸ In short, the glorification of the Name is deliberately ambiguous: It entails the glorification of both the Father and of the Son.⁹ This ambiguity may be highlighted by the lack of specified object in the reply of the voice in 12.28: “I have glorified [], and I will glorify [] again.”

Second, the theophanic reply, “I *have*...and I *will*,” suggests that Name-glorification has a temporally related meaning. The hour of Jesus’ glorification likely begins with Jesus’ crucifixion, but also extends beyond this.¹⁰ Closely related to the hour is the past and future Name-

⁵ Indeed, the Gospel castigates the idea of self-glorification (8.54).

⁶ Jesus’ “exaltation” is his “glorification.” Bultmann, 152, n.4.

⁷ There is an increasing recognition of the importance of John’s style of repetition and variation: He never repeats himself verbatim, but often returns to a word, phrase, or theme from various angles. By “repetition,” I mean the repetition of individual words, stems, synonyms, or phrases/expressions, in which variation is introduced by altering the word or phrase in some way. Van Belle identifies the following purposes of this technique: to highlight, generate expectation, cause reassessment, unify disparate elements, or build patterns of contrast or association. Gilbert van Belle, “Theory of Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: A Neglected Field of Research?,” in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 27-30. For a survey of scholarship on this aspect of Johannine style, see Gilbert van Belle, “Repetitions and Variations in Johannine Research: A General Historical Survey,” in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 33-86. For one representative list of repetitions, see chapter 5 “Variation—A Feature of Johannine Style” in Leon Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1969), 293-319.

⁸ Mark L. Appold, *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1976), 206-209. Textual variants highlight the exegetical ambiguity, as they are themselves an artefact of the attempt to clarify the ambiguity of the text: “Father, glorify your name, with the glory I had with you before the world was. And there was a voice from heaven...” (D); “glorify my name” (B); “glorify your son” (L X f^{1, 13} pc vg^{mss} sy^{hmg} bo). The latter variant likely reflects the influence of 17.1, indicating the tendency to read these verses together.

⁹ So Bultmann, 429. John’s use of ambiguity is well-documented. See Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment*, 33-122. Also, see discussion in chapter 4 of the deliberately ambiguous answer to the question posed in John 5.12: “who is the man who said to you...?”

¹⁰ Jesus’ glorification and hour are closely bound up with each other. Some commentators see the “hour” as referring only to the cross. Wilhelm Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im*

glorification. Three main options have been proposed for the meaning of this past and future glorification:

- (i) The past and future simply reflects an ongoing period of glorification¹¹
- (ii) Jesus' signs and passion¹²
- (iii) The hour just begun and future post-resurrection period¹³

Regardless of which of these options is correct, it is sufficient for present purposes to note simply that divine Name-glorification is inextricably bound up with Jesus' earthly mission in some respect, and tied, in particular, to the climax of that mission—the anticipated “hour.”¹⁴ Thus the Name *means* both Father and the Son as they are disclosed, particularly in the context of and in the wake of Jesus' earthly mission.

Johannesevangelium (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960), 81. Also, Margaret Pamment, "The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 36 (1985): 64. But John 13.31 indicates that the hour stretches beyond the crucifixion (cf. 7.33-34; 8.21-23; 20.17). Many recognize that the hour also includes resurrection. For listing of scholarship, see Benjamin E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 192, n.13. Similarly, Jesus' glorification is not limited to the crucifixion, although it includes this (12.23-24), for the Spirit cannot be given until after Jesus' glorification (7.39), and it is after the *resurrection* that this actually occurs (16.7; 20.17, 22). And the disciples “remember” events after Jesus was glorified in 12.16 but after his resurrection in 2.22. In 12.32, Jesus speaks of being lifted up *from the earth*. This cannot exclude crucifixion, as the explanation in 12.33 makes clear, but it may include more than just crucifixion. Frey suggests that Jesus' earthly work, and the post-resurrection era beginning with Jesus' death converge in the “hour” of his glorification. Jörg Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, vol. 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 136.

¹¹ Schnackenburg may be alone in his suggestion that there are no “stages” at all. Schnackenburg, II: 388. Even less likely is the suggestion that the past Name-glorification refers to all of God's self-revelation throughout Israel's history, since the petition to which the Father responds is a petition for Name-glorification in the sight of “the whole world” (12.19) and “all men” (12.32).

¹² Dodd, *Interpretation*, 373; Bultmann, 429; Barrett, 426. Nielsen takes a similar view, but identifies the aorist ἐδοξάσα with God's *sending* the Son. Jesper T. Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010): 363. Thüsing is similar, but he suggests that the aorist indicates the hour as well as Jesus' mission prior to the hour. And the future glorification is not so much the period indicated by 17.24-26 as it is Christ's gathering of “all men” (12.32). Thüsing, *Erhöhung und Verherrlichung*, 193-198.

¹³ Margaret Pamment, "The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW* 74 (1983): 13. Similarly, Westcott, 182; Brown, I: 477. Chibici-Revneanu could be listed here, although she emphasizes a distinction between glory “from” and glory “with” the Father, not past/future or heavenly/earthly glory. Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 187. Also Idem, "Variations on Glorification: John 13.31f. and Johannine Doxa-Language," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 521.

¹⁴ I am inclined toward the third option, and will take a similar view in the closely related 17.26.

Significance

To isolate the *significance* of the Name for John in 12.28, John's distinctive placement of the divine Name alongside the theme of glorification, and in the context of the arrival of Jesus' hour, should, first, be taken seriously. If the Name stands at the heart of Jesus' eschatological hour, then conversely, Jesus' hour marks *the* eschatological glorification of the divine Name. This likely reflects John's prior conviction that the divine Name was a central feature of eschatological expectation, now (at least partially) realized in Jesus' hour.

Second, since the Name means both the Father and the Son, Jesus' petition, "glorify your Name" (12.28) perfectly captures the dynamic interplay between the glory of both Father and Son, which is expressed more explicitly in 13.31-32: "Now the son of man is glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God is glorified in him, God also will glorify him in himself and will glorify him immediately."¹⁵ Perhaps the glorification of the divine Name amounts to a demonstration *that* the divine Name entails both Father and Son. In other words, for John, the divine Name is fundamentally *associative* in significance.

In sum, Name-glorification is at the heart of eschatological expectation, and entails the glorification of both the Father and Son. For John, the divine Name is fundamentally eschatological and associative in significance. And it is likely that these two aspects were, for him, mutually reinforcing: The associative significance of the divine Name allowed John to identify Jesus with the eschatological manifestation of the divine Name; and if Jesus was to be identified with eschatological Name-glorification, he must be identified in some way with the Name itself.

John 17.6, 26a

In John 17.6, Jesus claims "I have made known (Ἐφάνέρωσα) your Name to those whom you gave me," and repeats the claim with a synonymous revelatory (γνωρίζω) verb in 17.26a.¹⁶ In what

¹⁵ In his study of this text, G. B. Caird concludes that the ἐν αὐτῷ (i.e., in Jesus) in 13.31 "denotes the locus of God's glorification and not its agent." God (subject) glorifies himself in (locus) Jesus. Caird, "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel," 271.

¹⁶ John uses a variety of revelatory verbs, including ἐξηγέομαι, φανερώω, δείκνυμι, ἐμφανίζω, γνωρίζω, ἀποκαλύπτω, and even ἀναγγέλλω and λέγω. Of these, ἀναγγέλλω and λέγω are obviously used with reported speech, and as ἀποκαλύπτω appears only in a citation, it is not a key Johannine term. A case may be made for ἐξηγέομαι being particularly significant for John, as he uses it only once at the conclusion of the prologue, in a programmatic sentence (1.18). But the remaining four terms (φανερώω, δείκνυμι, ἐμφανίζω, γνωρίζω) are used interchangeably: The Father, "works," and Jesus' stigmata are *shown* (δείκνυμι) (5.20; 10.32; 14.8-9), but the Father's "works" are also *revealed* (φανερώω) (9.3). Jesus both *declares* (λέγω) and *makes*

follows, it is proposed that the Name *functions* within this statement to legitimate Jesus' entire mission; it *means* the character and action of God, which is disclosed through the earthly mission of Jesus; and its *significance* is eschatological and associative.

Function

It is widely recognized that the prayer of John 17 functions as the conclusion and culmination of the Farewell Discourse.¹⁷ Some observe, furthermore, that it is filled with “echoes” to preceding material beyond the Farewell Discourse.¹⁸ For Thüsing, it is a “Spiegel” in which the whole Gospel is reflected.¹⁹ And Okure argues it is essentially “a descriptive summary of Jesus’ mission, with respect both to its content and method.”²⁰ This summarizing function of John 17 is

known (γνωρίζω) what he hears from the Father (8.26, 40; 12.50; 15.15), and he also *makes* the Name *known* (17.26). And he both *reveals* (φανερώω) and *manifests* (ἐμφανίζω) himself (14.21-22; 21.1, 14). But he also reveals (φανερώω) the Father’s works (9.3) and the divine Name (17.6). Therefore, no special significance should be assigned to one or another of these revelatory verbs. The variation between Jesus *making known* (γνωρίζω) the Name in 17.26 and *revealing* (φανερώω) the Name in 17.6 is merely stylistic. So Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 71.

¹⁷ This is implied by the introductory Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν (17.1). Compare with 13.1. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 418; Brown, II: 744. Some rhetorical studies of John 13-17 regard Jesus’ prayer as an *epilogus* to the Farewell Discourse, i.e., what Aristotle called a “recapitulation of what has been shown.” Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, III. 19.1, 281. E.g., George A. Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 85. John C. Stube, *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 186-210. This is not to detract from its anticipatory function, looking ahead to the cross. E.g., Hoskyns, II: 586. Barrett (Barrett, 499) and Carson (Carson, 551) suggest the prayer looks back as well as forward to the cross. However, the emphasis of the prayer is on retrospect. The designation “Farewell Discourse” is used here simply to refer to John 13—17, without making any judgment on the compositional history of these chapters. In discussions of Johannine unity, John 17 has sometimes been singled out as a later addition, in part because it contains unique expressions such as those including the divine Name in 17.6, 11-12, 26. However, due to the large congruence between chapter 17 and the rest of the Gospel, it may well belong to the original version. See Wilckens, 235, 259. Recent studies of John’s repetitive style call into question our ability to identify seams and sources within GJohn. As van Belle puts it, “...it becomes extremely problematic to discern traditions or sources in the Fourth Gospel.” Van Belle, “Repetitions and Variations,” 85. If it is a later addition, it is a fitting one.

¹⁸ E.g., Dodd, *Interpretation*, 417; Schnackenburg, III: 202; Carson, 558; Paul N. Anderson, *The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 19. Thus, there is no better position for it than here, *pace* Bultmann, who suggested that originally it introduced the Farewell Discourse. Bultmann, 460-461.

¹⁹ Wilhelm Thüsing, *Herrlichkeit und Einheit: Eine Auslegung des hohepriesterlichen Gebetes Jesu (Johannes 17)* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1962), 5.

²⁰ Teresa Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4.1-42* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 213. Much scholarly ink has been spilt on the subject of “mission” in GJohn. By Jesus’ “mission,” I simply mean here the task for which Jesus was sent, which Okure helpfully summarizes as a mission “to reveal the Father and thus bring life, light, and knowledge to those who believe in him.” Okure, *Mission*, 24. More exhaustively, his task may be summarized as doing “the Father’s work (4.34; 17.4) and will

achieved primarily through the petitions and retrospective comments which characterize the prayer.²¹

In this context, it may be argued that Jesus' claim, "I have made known your Name" (17.6; cf. v.26a) refers to and summarizes Jesus' mission, including his hour.²² Of all the retrospective comments in John 17, nearly all echo earlier precedents: Jesus

- v2: was given authority (cf. 5.27)
- v2, 6, 9: was given followers (cf. 6.39)
- v4: glorified the Father (cf. 11.4; 13.31-32; 14.13)
- v4: was given work to complete (cf. 4.34; 9.4)
- vv.8, 14: gave divine words to followers (cf. 3.34; 14.10, 24)
- v8, 18, 25: was sent by the Father (cf. 5.30, 37)
- v10; cf. v 22, 24: was glorified (cf. 11.4; 12.23; 13.31-32)
- v12: kept his followers in the divine Name and guarded them (cf. 6.37-40; 10.28)
- v18: sent followers into the world (cf. 4.38; 13.15-20)
- vv.23, 24, 26: was loved by the Father (cf. 3.35; 5.20; 10.17; 15.9)

Interestingly, the only retrospective comments without precedent feature divine Name and glory: Jesus

- v5: had glory before the world
- vv.6, 26a: made known the divine Name
- vv.11, 12: was given the divine Name
- v22: gave glory to followers

(5.30; 6.38), to witness by his word and deed to the things he has seen and heard from the Father (3.11, 32; 5.19; 8.26, 28b, 38, 40) or personally to report concerning the Father (1.18; 14.9)...to save the world (3.17; cf. 1.29; 4.42), not to judge the world (8.15; 12.47) or to give eternal life to those who believe in him (3.16; 4.10, 14; 10.10; 17.2; 20.30-31)." Ibid., 3. In John 17, the mission of giving life "to all flesh" is achieved by making known the Name. Ibid., 214. For a helpful survey of major studies on mission in GJohn, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 5-16.

²¹ Appold notes that the exchange between retrospect and petition is the primary "literary principle" employed in John 17. Appold, *Oneness*, 224. Daniel B. Stevick, *Jesus and His Own: A Commentary on John 13-17* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 317.

²² Because Jesus refers to his own disciples in 17.6 and future believers in 17.26a, it is possible that two separate revelations are in view here. Brown suggests the past revelation in 17.26a is Jesus' work which his disciples would later "communicate" to believers (Brown, II: 781). However, it is simpler to see both verses 6 and 26 as encompassing the whole of Jesus' mission, including his passion. Although the prayer precedes the passion narratively, it stands over and beyond the time of Jesus' earthly mission, including his death. It makes no sense for Jesus to be no longer in the world (17.11) and not yet glorified (17.1), since glorification and departure are bound up together. And the completion of mission and commissioning of disciples claimed in vv.4, 18 do not occur until 19.31 and 20.21 (respectively). Thus, rather than being part of a prayer-in-time, Jesus' petitions function theologically to underscore the goal of glorification that shapes his earthly mission as well as a pastoral concern for future generations to "listen in" on Jesus' interest in them.

Since these exceptions are embedded in a pattern of retrospective summary, they are not without precedent, but rather gather up or stand in for themes introduced earlier. Jesus' claim to have given his followers divine glory (17.22) may gather up references to believers receiving "grace...from his fullness" (1.16),²³ "the Spirit without measure" (3.34), or "life in abundance" (10.10) as "the culmination and summary" of all the disciples are given.²⁴ Similarly, Jesus' claim to have been given the divine Name (17.11-12) may recall and epitomize 13.3: "...the Father had given all things into his hands," or crystallize the claim of 6.27: "this one, God the Father has sealed." It is best to regard Jesus' claim to Name-revelation (17.6, 26a), likewise, as a summary of Jesus' entire revelatory mission. Several observations of the text support this inference.

First, Jesus' Name-revelation is bound up with his sharing "the words" he received from the Father (17.6, 8). In 17.6, believers keep the word as a consequence of the Name-revelation, which may imply that Jesus reveals the Name by giving the word(s). And the knowledge that Jesus comes from the Father is the result of receiving these words in verse 8, but grounded in the Name-revelation in verses 25-26. As the word(s) are integral to Jesus' revelatory mission throughout GJohn,²⁵ this aspect of his mission is gathered up in the Name-revelation.

Second, the Name-revelation is bound up with the "work" that Jesus completed (τελείω) (17.4). The "work" of salvation harvest (4.34) illustrated by the harvest of Samaritans in John 4.39-42, is the consequence of Jesus' self-revelation "I am" (4.26). Furthermore, the work itself entails revelation: The "work" includes the "works" whose function is to reveal the *Father* in the Son,²⁶ and it includes the cross—the locus of climactic revelation and glorification of the *Son* (8.28; 12.23, 31)—completed (τελείω) in 19.30.²⁷ Indeed, it is ultimately through Jesus' death that the work of harvest is made possible.²⁸ Thus salvation harvest and revelation are inseparable in

²³ In 1.14, Jesus' *glory* is identified as "full of grace."

²⁴ Schnackenburg, III: 192. Cook suggests, similarly, that "glory" is not *a* motif, but "*the* motif of the Johannine corpus." Cook, "The Glory Motif in the Johannine Corpus," 291-297. Emphasis mine.

²⁵ John 2.22; 3.34; 5.24; 6.63, 68; 8.31, 47, 51-52; 12.47; 14.10, 23-24; 15.3, 7; 17.1.

²⁶ John 8.19, 27; 10.38; 12.45; 14.9-10. Bultmann notes that Jesus' "works" refer to the whole of his work as Revealer. Bultmann, 279. His "works" are roughly parallel to his "signs," and both comprise the singular "work" which is his entire mission (4.34; 17.4). The "greater works" in 5.20 are the temporally subsequent works Jesus will do, such as healing the blind man and raising Lazarus, which will manifest Jesus' true and living power to resurrect or judge (5.21-22). These should not be confused with the eschatological works of resurrection/judgment (5.28-29). Schnackenburg, II: 105.

²⁷ In 17.4, Jesus speaks proleptically. See n.22.

²⁸ At the arrival of his hour in chapter 12, Jesus uses an agricultural image similar to 4.34 to describe the mission for which he came, and which is fully accomplished in his death (cf. τετέλεσται in

GJohn. Jesus' mission entails divine and self-revelation, and results in salvation harvest (or life-giving),²⁹ and true worship.³⁰ This should come as no surprise, since salvation is contingent on knowing the Father and Son (17.3),³¹ and knowing the "one true God" (17.3) is the necessary precursor to being a "true worshiper" (4.23): "we worship what³² we know" (4.22). It follows that the claims to have revealed the Name (17.6) and completed the work (17.4) are inseparable.

Third, since Jesus achieves his "work" in John 4 through the self-revelatory claim "I am," it may be that his claim to divine Name-revelation functions as a summary of other non-predicative "I am" sayings as well (4.26; 8.24, 28, 58; 13.19; 18.5-8). Interestingly, Jesus' "exaltation" (ὑψόω) is simultaneously the moment of self-revelation ("you will know that I am" in 8.28) and Name-glorification (12.28; cf. 12.32). In addition, the purpose of Jesus' self-revelation, "I am," is to fulfill his promise not to "lose any" (18.8-9), i.e., to "keep" them in the Name (17.12), which he achieves by revealing the Name (17.6).³³ Corresponding to this is the fact that Judas' betrayal (compare 13.19 and 18.5-8) is contrasted with the divine Name in two respects. Judas' entrance into darkness (13.32) marks him out for the judgment (cf. 3.18-20) that began at the moment of Name-glorification (12.28, 32). And Judas' betrayal excludes him from being kept "in my Father's name" (17.12). All of this need not indicate that the Name Jesus reveals is "I am," any more than that it is

19.30): "unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains just a single grain; but if it dies, it bears much fruit" (12.24). The narrative surrounding 4.34, in which the Samaritan woman and her town come to faith (4.39-42), functions as a symbolic illustration of Jesus accomplishing this work.

²⁹ Bultmann's suggestion that "John has subsumed the death of Jesus under his idea of the Revelation" may be an overstatement. Rudolph Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 2 (New York: Scribners, 1955), 53. Although prominent in Jesus' mission, revelation remains subordinate to life-giving (see 10.10; 20.31). Scrutton argues rightly that, for John, "revelation is the means of salvation, and knowledge of God the substance of salvation itself." Anastasia Scrutton, "The Truth will set you Free: Salvation as Revelation," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 363. Also Okure, *Mission*, 128, 214. For further discussion of "mission," see n.20.

³⁰ Barrett argues that worship is Jesus' secondary mission in GJohn. Barrett, "Christocentric or Theocentric?," 14-16; Also Barrett, "The Father Is Greater Than I," 32. Okure does not isolate "true worship" as a secondary mission, but incorporates it into the mission of life-giving. She says the fruit of Jesus' mission is the Spirit, through whom eternal life is realized. She continues: "...it is the Spirit who also enables true worship, the personal and communal expression of this new life as it relates to God." Okure, *Mission*, 128.

³¹ "Harvest" (4.34) and "eternal life" (17.3) are both salvific concepts for John, associated with each other in 12.24-25. On a parallel note, "drawing" (ἐλκω), which is a salvific concept for John (6.44; 12.32), is contingent upon revelation: "when I am lifted up [i.e., glorified]..." (12.32).

³² Although neuter, the relative here most likely refers to God.

³³ Williams suggests, similarly, that Jesus' preservation of the disciples in chapter 18 is a "symbolic anticipation of Jesus' ability to give life." Catrin H. Williams, "'I Am' or 'I Am He?': Self-Declaratory Pronouncements in the Fourth Gospel and Rabbinic Tradition," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 352.

Jesus' words or works.³⁴ Rather, the full significance of these statements are gathered up and summarized in Jesus' claim to divine Name-revelation.

Fourth, Jesus' Name-revelation recalls and summarizes the glorification (and implicit revelation) of both the Name and himself at the heart of his mission (12.28). Both 12.28 and 17.1-26 are prayers, framed by the arrival of Jesus' hour (12.23; 17.1), and permeated by a concern for God's glory and Name. Moreover, 12.28 is nearly replicated in 17.1. Keener rightly suggests, then, that Jesus' prayer in 12.28 "may represent the nucleus which is continued and developed more fully in Jesus' next and final Johannine prayer in ch. 17."³⁵ In this context, it is likely that John 17.26 represents a variation on 12.28, given the corresponding verb-tense changes, the repetition of καί, and the object ὄνομα:³⁶

καὶ ἐδόξασα [τὸ ὄνομα] καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω (12.28)

καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα σου καὶ γνώρισω (17.26)

If the hour for which Jesus came is ultimately an hour featuring divine Name-glorification, it follows similarly that Jesus' entire mission could be summarized in terms of Name-revelation. In summary, the claim of 17.6, 26a summarizes the whole of Jesus' revelatory mission, and as such, corresponds to the mission summary in the prologue (1.14-18).³⁷

However, John uses the Name in particular as a summary of Jesus' revelatory mission in order to invest Jesus himself and his mission with the highest possible legitimacy. Just as the theophanic voice in 12.28 legitimates the claims made for Jesus in preceding polemical contexts, so the claim to have revealed the *Name* in chapter 17 legitimates the claim that Jesus is the locus of revelation, and the means of salvation. Believers see the Father in the Son (12.45; 14.9) and have "life" in his name (20.31) because he reveals the divine Name.³⁸ Furthermore, the Name-revelation implicitly legitimates the efficacy attributed to Jesus' name in prayer. In Jewish tradition,

³⁴ Pace Brown, II: 756.

³⁵ Keener, II: 876.

³⁶ Appold, *Oneness*, 206-209.

³⁷ Cf. n.47

³⁸ Barrett suggests correctly that the claim "whoever has seen me has seen the Father" (14.9; cf. 12.45) is "wound up" in 17.26: "I have made your name known to them." Barrett, "Christocentric or Theocentric," 8. Moloney argues that ἑφ'ανέρωσα in 17.6 is a "complexive" aorist, encompassing the completed action as a whole. Moloney, 462. Cf. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 71. And Untergassmair observes that here we discover *what* Jesus is revealing in his mission: "Denn hier erscheint das ὄνομα des Vaters selbst als Objekt des Offenbarungswirkens Jesu." Ibid., 70.

believers invoked God in/on/by³⁹ “your name,”⁴⁰ the essential prerequisite of which was *knowledge* of the divine Name.⁴¹ However, in GJohn, although the *divine* Name is “made known” (17.6, 26), invocation is made in *Jesus’* name.⁴² And as calling “on the name of the Lord” functioned in tradition to identify those included in the people of God,⁴³ this role is filled by *Jesus’* name in GJohn. Although the efficacy of Jesus’ name in prayer is anticipated in Paul (e.g., 1 Cor 1.10) and Acts,⁴⁴ John bifurcates the OT petitionary function of the divine Name by implicitly legitimating this use of Jesus’ name, hitherto unknown to the disciples (16.24), in the revelation of the divine Name. It is not that Jesus’ name is, or displaces or supersedes the divine Name.⁴⁵ Rather, it contributes to, exposit, and is bound up with the divine Name. In sum, the divine Name functions in 17.6, 26a to summarize Jesus’ revelatory mission, and to invest both the mission and Jesus himself with legitimacy.

Meaning

If the divine Name summarizes Jesus’ revelatory mission, it follows that the *meaning* of the Name is that which is revealed and achieved in that mission, as described in the preceding passages of which 17.6 is a summation. Conversely, readers are invited to understand those

³⁹ The ׀ prefix can be rendered “in,” “by,” or “upon” (both MT and Targum). But the LXX takes the latter by using ἐπικαλέω.

⁴⁰ Isa 64.6; cf. Ps 78[79].6; Jer 10.25; Isa 65.1; Joel 3.35[2.32].

⁴¹ In Jeremiah 10.25, it is those who *know* God who invoke his Name. The promise of Name revelation in Isaiah 64.2[1] comes in the context of the failure of Israel to call on the divine Name (Isa 64.6[7]; 65.1; cf. similarly Isa 48.1 and 52.6). The same relationship is reflected in T. Levi 5.5, although the figure in view is not God: “I beg you, Lord, teach me (διδάξόν με, or εἰπέ μοι in some mss) your name, *so that* I may call on you in the day of tribulation.” Translation from “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” trans. Howard C. Kee, in *OTP*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 790. One rabbinical explanation (Phinehas b. Jair) for ineffectual prayer was “Because they do not know the Ineffable Name” which God would reveal as he promised in Isaiah 52.6. Midr. Ps. 91.8 (Braude). Cf. *Pesikta Rabbati* 22.7. Greek traditions are similar in this regard. See H. J. Rose, “Divine Names in Classical Greece,” *HTR* 51 (1958): 22, 28, 32. However, worship of unnamed gods was relatively common. *Ibid.*, 23.

⁴² John 14.13-14; 15.16; 16.23-24, 26. Davis has demonstrated that the expression to “call on the name” occurs in pre-Christian Judaism only with a divine object. Davis, *Name and Way*, 116.

⁴³ Davis, *Name and Way*, 106. See Joel 3.35[2.32]; 1 Kgs 18.24-26; Isa 12.4-6; 41.25; Ps 104[105].1.

⁴⁴ Calling “on the name of the Lord” (Joel 3.35[2.32]) is taken in Acts 2.21 to be invoking Jesus (cf. Acts 2.36; 19.5, 13, 17; 21.13).

⁴⁵ Pace Grether, who suggests “Der schem-Begriff findet also im neutestamentlichen ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ als dem Namen des Vaters Jesu Christi bzw. im ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ sein Erfüllung.” Grether, *Name und Wort*, 183. John never conflates Jesus’ name with the divine Name.

passages as ultimately describing divine Name-revelation. In what follows, it is proposed that the Name means the character and action of the Father as expressed uniquely in the Son.

At one level, the Name means the disclosure of the Father himself. At the conclusion of the prologue (1.1-18), Jesus' revelatory mission is summarized in advance of the narrative: "we beheld his glory...No one has ever seen God."⁴⁶ God⁴⁷ the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father—that one has made him known" (1.14-18). This prospective summary and Jesus' retrospective claim in 17.6 serve as bookends for the revelatory mission, which climaxes in Jesus' hour—the hour of Name-glorification (12.28).⁴⁸ Ruck-Schröder takes this too far, however, with her assumption that, on the basis of 1.18, the revelation of the Name means *merely* a revelation of the divine *Wesen*.⁴⁹ Not only does this import a category foreign to John's thinking (*Wesen*), it also unnecessarily prioritizes 1.18 over 17.6, flattening "Name" to accord with 1.18.

Rather, as the summary of the revelatory mission introduced in 1.14-18, the Name-revelation of 17.6 informs and expands our understanding of that mission, drawing attention in particular to the divine character described in 1.14: "glory, *full of grace and truth*."⁵⁰ Interestingly, both passages (1.14-18; 17.1-26) focus on the manifestation of divine glory and the divine Name. Not only are divine glory and Name featured prominently in the summative claims of John 17, they are closely parallel with each other: Both are given to Jesus, and both are instrumental in believers sharing in the oneness of the Father and Son (17.11, 22). More significantly, in the final section of the prayer (vv. 24-26), Jesus' desire for disciples to see his glory in 17.24 is inextricably linked with his promise to make known the divine Name: Although Jesus' glory, which he gives his followers

⁴⁶ Pace Appold, the glory seen in 1.14 cannot be restricted to the Incarnation, only to "receiv[e] further expression" in Jesus' hour. Appold, *Oneness*, 230. Rather, 1.14 summarizes Jesus whole mission, including his hour.

⁴⁷ The notoriously difficult text-critical issue here makes no difference to our purposes.

⁴⁸ Wilckens refers to the prologue and the prayer of John 17 as the "Ausgangspunkt" and "Zielpunkt" (respectively) of Jesus' mission. Wilckens, 259. Käsemann, similarly, regards John 17 as the "counterpart" of the prologue. Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 3.

⁴⁹ Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 211-212.

⁵⁰ I am not the first to suggest this. Hanson suggested that "The revelation of God's name means the revelation of God as grace (mercy, love) and truth (faithfulness)." Anthony T. Hanson, *Grace and Truth: A Study in the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SPCK, 1975), 35. And others have made a similar point, but on unwarranted grounds. Tsouderov conflates *δίδωμι* with *τήρεω* when he suggests that believers become "one" in 17.11 because the petition that they be kept in the Name means they are *given* divine grace and truth, and consequently participate in divine character. Tsouderov, "Glory, Grace, and Truth," 266. And Kerr tries to link the revelation of "grace and truth" with the Name-revelation via the "I am" sayings. Kerr, *Temple*, 336-345. Yet there is no warrant for this, nor for his assumption that the Name revealed *is* "I am."

(17.22), is the consequence of the Father's love for him (17.24), believers come to know that same love as a consequence, not of seeing his glory, but of Name-revelation (17.26b). Thus Jesus' desire that his followers see his glory (17.24) should be understood as parallel to his promise to reveal the divine Name (17.26b). Now, Jesus' petition in 17.24, ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν expresses the goal of the true disciple, like Isaiah (12.41), and recalls the similarly constructed confession of 1.14: ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. The believers formed around John's Gospel are those in whom Jesus' desire (17.24) is fulfilled (1.14), or at least partially realized. Therefore, the parallel promise of Name-revelation (17.26b) could well be regarded as a similar anticipation of that which the community claims to have beheld: a glory "full of grace and truth."

This becomes more probable when it is observed that the expression "full of grace and truth"⁵¹ almost certainly constitutes an allusion to the scene of divine Name proclamation in Exodus 34.5-7.⁵² In Exodus 33—34, Moses cannot see God's face (33.20), but he is promised a vision of glory (Exod 33.18-19), which turns out to be a proclamation of the divine Name (Exod 34.5).⁵³ The Name itself is an exposition of the faithful and gracious character of God, revealed in response to the apostasy of Israel: "The Lord God, compassionate and merciful, patient and great in mercy and true" (Exod 34.5-6). Although these phrases were replicated throughout the Jewish Scriptures,⁵⁴ John recalls the Exodus period generally with his tabernacle language (σκηνώω in 1.14; cf. Exod 33.7), and this scene more particularly when he notes that "[n]o one has ever seen God"

⁵¹ There is some debate over how to render χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. Many opt for some form of hendiadys: de la Potterie takes the expression to mean "le don de la révélation." Ignace de la Potterie, "Χάρις paulinienne et Χάρις johannique," in *Jesus und Paulus*, ed. E. Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 260, 267. Moloney takes the καὶ in πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας as exegetical: "fullness of a gift, which is truth." Moloney, 45. Schnackenburg opts for a hendiadys which takes ἀληθείας as the subordinate term (i.e., "faithful grace"). Schnackenburg, I: 273. However, if the tradition of Exodus 34 is in view here, then the expression more likely refers to the distinctive, subjective divine character—"full of grace and truth." For an extensive defense of this view, see Tsouderov, "Glory, Grace, and Truth," 129-190.

⁵² Anthony T. Hanson, "John 1.14-18 and Exodus 34," *NTS* 23 (1976): 90-101. Morna D. Hooker, "The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret," *NTS* 21 (1974): 54-56. Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 79. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 288, n.2. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, 150. Andreas J. Köstenberger, *Encountering John: The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1999), 52. Tsouderov, "Glory, Grace, and Truth," 63-122. Beasley-Murray, 14-15; Carson, 129, 134; Lindars, 95, 98; Schnackenburg, I: 272; Morris, 95; Brown, I: 14, 36. Only a few deny any connection. E.g., Bultmann, 67; de la Potterie, "Χάρις," 258-259.

⁵³ If, as it appears, Isaiah 64.2-3[1-2] evokes Exodus 34.5, 10, then Isaiah regards the whole scene fundamentally as a revelation of the divine Name: καὶ φανερόν ἐσται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (Isa 64.2[1]).

⁵⁴ The language reflected in Exodus 34.6-7 is clearly echoed in several passages: Ps 85[86].15; 102[103].8; 144[145].8; Num 14.18; Joel 2.13; Nah 1.3; Jonah 4.2.

(1.18; cf. Exod 33.20) and that “the law was given through Moses” (1.17; cf. Exod 34.1-4, 27-28).

Furthermore, by confessing “we beheld [Jesus’] glory,” and qualifying this glory as being πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (1.14),⁵⁵ John identifies Jesus as the locus of the divine glory and the divine Name-character that God revealed to Moses.⁵⁶ Jesus is contrasted with Moses in 1.17, not simply because he is a better mediator of divine revelation and gifts, but because he embodies them. In addition, just as the divine Name-character of Exodus 34.6-7 is summarized in Exodus 33.19 as “all my goodness,” so John similarly summarizes this character in the word πλήρωμα (1.16).⁵⁷

John’s awareness of the context of Exodus 34 indicates that he may well have regarded “full of grace and truth” as the *meaning* of the divine Name. Perhaps part of the superiority of “grace and truth” to the Law that came through Moses lies in the fact that they represent the manifestation of God’s own Name. Furthermore, in Exodus, the pervasive theme of divine Name-revelation is inextricably linked with the particular display of God’s action and character in the exodus event. Consequently, the epithets in Exodus 34.6-7 came in subsequent tradition to represent divine exodus-like activity and its corresponding Name-revelation.⁵⁸ Similarly, for John, both “glory, full of grace and truth” (1.14) and the divine Name (17.6, 26) summarize the revelatory mission of Jesus, which ultimately features the disclosure of divine action (5.19; 14.10).⁵⁹ It is possible that the motif of love further cements this link. Although it is probably misguided to equate χάρις in 1.14 directly with ἀγάπη,⁶⁰ Jesus’ mission is simultaneously characterized by “grace and truth,” and as the expression of divine love, since Jesus is “given” and “sent” out of divine love

⁵⁵ The LXX of Exodus 34.5 πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός does not accord exactly with John 1.14 πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. This has led some scholars to suppose that John drew directly from the HB at this point, since χάριτος more accurately reflects the HB מַחֲסֵד וְדֹכָה. If so, it is noteworthy that, whereas in the LXX, the Lord “call[s] in/by the name,” the HB much more strongly frames the character revelation as a proclamation of the Name, which seems to have been picked up in Isaiah 64.1-3[63.19-64.2].

⁵⁶ Hanson suggests that John thought Moses saw the pre-existent *Logos* in Exodus 34, as he supposes did Isaiah in 12.41. Hanson, “John 1.14-18,” 96-97. However, Isaiah more likely sees the *future* ministry of Jesus. See chapter 1. For John, Jesus is simply the full manifestation of the glory and Name introduced in Exodus.

⁵⁷ Hooker, “Johannine Prologue,” 54.

⁵⁸ See Charles Gianotti, “The Meaning of the Divine Name YHWH,” *BSac* 142 (1985): 38-48. Similarly, Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton*, 21-27; Christopher Seitz “The Call of Moses and the ‘Revelation’ of the Divine Name,” in *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness*, ed. Christopher Seitz (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 229-247.

⁵⁹ Although χάρις does not occur after the prologue, its placement in the prologue signals its summative importance.

⁶⁰ Pace Brown, I: 14, 16.

(3.16; cf. 17.23).⁶¹ It is interesting then that, in John 17, belief in divine love is formed and sustained by Name-revelation (17.26), leading Schnackenburg to suggest that the Name in John 17 is bound up with the communication of divine love.⁶² Perhaps this overlap reflects an overlap in meaning between “grace and truth” and the divine Name. And perhaps the two halves of the confession “we beheld his glory...full of grace and truth” represent the partial realization of Jesus’ desire in John 17 that followers see his glory *and* his promise to reveal the divine Name.⁶³ In short, the Name revealed in John 17 means the divine character of grace and truth.

Significance

In the foregoing discussion, it has been argued that the divine Name functions in 17.6, 26a to summarize Jesus’ revelatory mission, and to legitimate Jesus in that mission. Furthermore, the Name means the divine Name character of “grace and truth” introduced in Exodus 34. These conclusions, in turn, help to establish that for John, the divine Name is primarily associative and eschatological in significance.

a) Associative

The summative and legitimating functions of the Name-revelation invite readers to regard the Name as gathering up both Jesus’ disclosure of the Father and his self-revelation. The “work” bound up with Name-revelation in 17.4-6 entails the disclosure of the *Father* in Jesus’ works, as well as the cross in which *Jesus* is glorified. Similarly, the Name-revelation summarizes both Jesus’ mission to reveal the Father (1.18) and his self-revelation “I am.” And it is striking that Jesus’ claim to reveal the Father’s Name, in turn, functions to legitimate Jesus himself in his

⁶¹ It may be objected that John 3.16 is foreign to John’s thought, since apart from this instance, God’s love is reserved only for the Son and his disciples (e.g., 17.23). See, e.g., Fernando F. Segovia, *Love Relationships in the Johannine Tradition: Agape/Agapan in 1 John and the Fourth Gospel* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 170-179. However, Jörg Frey has argued persuasively that 3.16 accords with John’s thought, and indeed may be programmatic for Jesus’ mission. It is Johannine to identify divine love with the sending of Jesus (1 John 4.9-10, *contra* Gal 4.4; Rom 8.3), and perhaps also with Jesus’ death (John 10.17), which reflects both Jesus’ love for others (13.1; 15.13) and the Father’s love (3.16). And the universal object of love (“the world”) accords with the universal remit of Jesus’ mission (cf. 4.42; 6.51). Jörg Frey, “Love-Relations in the Fourth Gospel: Establishing a Semantic Network,” in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*, ed. Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 185-189.

⁶² Schnackenburg, III: 197.

⁶³ If the prologue is a later addition, the links between 1.14 and John 17 adduced here suggest that 1.14 was composed in reflection upon John 17 and Jesus’ mission of Name-revelation. If it is original, then we can even more confidently see in 17.6 the crystallization of what John hints at in 1.14.

revelatory mission, and even the use of his own name in invocation. In short, for John, the Name itself is a coin, the two sides of which are revelation of the Son and revelation of the Father.

The same point emerges from a comparison with 12.28. Earlier, it was suggested that 17.26 represents a variation of 12.28:

καὶ ἐδόξασα [τὸ ὄνομα] καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω (12.28)

καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνώρισω (17.26)

The variations themselves are suggestive: John changes the subject from the Father to the Son, which generates ambiguity between Father and Son.⁶⁴ As Name-glorification entails *both* the glorification of the Father and of the Son, so Name-revelation is as much a revelation of the Son as it is of the Father. Furthermore, the verb change from δοξάζω to γνωρίζω invites readers to consider if what appeared to be a petition for God to *glorify* his Name was in fact a petition for God to *reveal* his own Name.⁶⁵ The fact that this revelation is achieved by Jesus makes him the answer to his own petition in 12.28—further contributing to the ambiguity between Father and Son.

As with function, so the meaning of the Name in 17.6, 26a invites readers to regard the Name as associative. On the one hand, the Name means simply God himself, whom the Son comes to reveal (1.18). However, it is the *Logos* who bears the divine Name character of “grace and truth” (1.14). Therefore, Jesus’ revelatory mission of Name-revelation means the disclosure of divine character and action, and the ultimate expression of divine love, as well as the disclosure of the glory of the Son, and his own love. For John, the Name-revelation is not merely conveyed through the Son, but entails the Son, because the Name is the locus for the profound association of Jesus and the Father. It is not that the Name simply codes for Jesus himself.⁶⁶ Rather, the Name revealed is the fact that the Name itself is shared between Father and Son.

b) Eschatological

In addition, John’s locating the divine Name at the heart of Jesus’ eschatological mission suggests that he regarded the Name itself as that which would be divinely disclosed

⁶⁴ This corresponds to the ambiguity we noted earlier between “your name” (12.28) and “your son” (17.1).

⁶⁵ Of course glorification and revelation are closely related concepts in GJohn. It is when Jesus is “lifted up” (i.e., “glorified”) that “you will know” (γνώσεσθε). The glorification *makes known*.

⁶⁶ Pace Appold, *Oneness*, 299.

eschatologically. The summative function of the Name-revelation highlights the prominence which John accords the Name. It is no coincidence that both Name-glorification and Name-revelation occur at the arrival of Jesus' eschatological hour (12.23; 17.1). John is convinced that the eschatological event of Name-revelation occurred in Jesus.

Perhaps John also regarded the disclosure of "grace and truth," of which the Name-revelation is a summation, as eschatological. Interestingly, John distinguishes the Law from divine Name character revealed in Exodus 34: "The law indeed was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (1.17). Although Moses had not seen God, he had "heard" the Name. But by identifying this Name character solely with Jesus, John implies that the Name proclamation in Exodus 34 was a prophetic witness, anticipating the eschatological full disclosure of the Name. Similarly God's descent to the mountain to proclaim his Name (Exod 34.5; cf. Isa 64.1-2[2-3]), anticipates Jesus' descent to reveal the divine Name.⁶⁷ Perhaps John would have regarded Exodus 34.5-6 as part of the text in which Moses wrote about Jesus (5.46).

It may be concluded that John deploys the Name category as a summary of Jesus' revelatory mission and to legitimate Jesus in that mission precisely because the Name was eschatological and associative in significance.

John 17.26b

In John 17.26b, Jesus promises to reveal the Name in future: *καὶ γνωρίσω [αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου]*. As it comes at the conclusion of the final section of the prayer, in which Jesus intercedes for future generation(s) of believers,⁶⁸ it occurs in that period.⁶⁹ The *καί* suggests this future Name-revelation

⁶⁷ Jesus' "descending" motif appears primarily in the context of his Bread discourse (John 6.33, 38, 41-42, 50-51, 58; but also 3.13). The contrast between the manna (which had become a symbol of the law-giving) and Jesus the "true bread" corresponds to the contrast between the law through Moses and "grace and truth" through Jesus. "Descent" language is a general revelatory motif, often replaced by revelatory language in the Targums (e.g., Tg. Gen. 11.5; Tg. Exod. 19.11; Tg. Num. 11.17, 25; 12.5; Tg. Isa. 31.4; 63.19; 64.2).

⁶⁸ Most scholars agree on three general sections: Jesus prays for himself (vv.1-5), for his followers (vv.6-19), and for future believers (vv.20-26). E.g., Morris, 716; Schnackenburg, III: 167-169. Some include vv. 6-8 with the first section, because there is no explicit petition for disciples. Bernard, II: 559; Brown, II: 749-750. Moloney, 459. Cf. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 417-118. And some isolate vv.24-26 as a distinct fourth section. e.g., Barrett, 499; Carson, 553-570; Lindars, 515. For a balanced assessment of the structure of John 17, see Rudolph Schnackenburg, "Strukturanalyse von Joh 17," *BZ 17* (1973): 67-78, 196-202. For a helpful survey of some of the main studies on the structure of John 17, see Marianus Pale Hera, *Christology and Discipleship in John 17* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 18-21.

⁶⁹ So Barrett, 515; Brown, II: 781.

is in continuity with that already completed.⁷⁰ But it may also indicate a certain progress to further revelation.⁷¹

Function

Just as Jesus' claim to Name-revelation summarized his completed mission, so his promise of future revelation summarizes his ongoing mission to the future community, and corresponds in function to the comfort that future mission affords John's readers.

The final form of the Farewell Discourse (chs 13—17) is likely intended to comfort the believers of John's day, who faced the challenge of Jesus' absence (14.1, 27), the world's hatred (15.18-25) and even the threat of death (16.2-3), and who are thus fittingly addressed directly at the conclusion of the Discourse (17.20-26).⁷² In this, Jesus' promises are central. It is tempting to conflate promises of Jesus' coming, indwelling, and gift of the Paraclete in John 14—16 with one another. Jesus' promise to "come again" in 14.2-3 is taken by some to refer to his resurrection,⁷³ but is usually regarded as a traditional logion about the final *parousia* (cf. 1 Thess 4.16-17) that has been reinterpreted by John to mean revelatory experiences of Jesus,⁷⁴ Jesus' coming to believers at their own death,⁷⁵ or his spiritual union with believers,⁷⁶ often regarded as occurring in the Spirit.⁷⁷ Yet Jörg Frey has argued persuasively that John retains a distinct traditional hope of

⁷⁰ Moloney suggests that the future Name-revelation is achieved *by* future believers. Moloney, 476-477. However, this drives a wedge between past revelation *to* them (αὐτοῖς) and future revelation, which is not warranted by the context.

⁷¹ Schnackenburg, III: 196.

⁷² Frey describes John as employing a "temporale Stereoskopie," in which Jesus' words to the pre-Easter disciples simultaneously address the questions of post-Easter believers. Jörg Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, vol. 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 234. Idem, "Eschatology in the Johannine Circle," 67-72.

⁷³ Lindars, 471; Carson, 501; Christian Dietzfelbinger, *Der Abschied des Kommenden: Eine Auslegung der johanneischen Abschiedsreden* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 81.

⁷⁴ David E. Aune, *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 129-133. Aune regards the coming of 14.3 and of 14.23 as inextricably linked such that the cultic experiences of the community have become conceptualized in traditional *parousia* language. The coming is a "cultic coming of Jesus in the form of a pneumatic or prophetic *visio Christi* within the setting of worship 'in the Spirit' as celebrated by the Johannine community." Ibid., 129. By pneumatic he means a personal Christophany, and by prophetic he means the prophetic agency of charismatic leaders, who are to be received "as the Lord" (cf. Did. 4.1; 11.2).

⁷⁵ Brown is open to this suggestion, with reservations. Brown, II: 626.

⁷⁶ Dodd, *Interpretation*, 404-405; Brown, II: 627.

⁷⁷ Bultmann, 617-618. Ashton tries to synthesize the promises of John 14 by suggesting that it features consolation in three distinct ways: The "cultic anticipation of a distant dream," mystical union with

future eschatology, and that the promises of Jesus' return, his indwelling believers, and the gift of the Spirit should not be conflated.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, these promises are united by their common function to comfort "a community in tribulation and distress."⁷⁹

In this context, it is plausible that the future Name-revelation shares in this function of comforting a future community of believers.⁸⁰ Moreover, as it occurs as the final promise in the section addressed directly to this future generation, it likely functioned for John as something of a meta-category (as it does in 17.6), which gathers up and summarizes these various promises to future believers. This becomes clear upon closer inspection. First, several parallels between 17.20-26 and 14.18-24 (some stronger than others), suggest a correspondence between Jesus' promise of future Name-revelation and future self-disclosure. As in 17.20-26, so in John 14, reference is made to "seeing" Jesus in the future (14.19; cf. 17.24), a mutual indwelling (14.20; cf. 17.21, 23, 26), a future knowledge about Jesus (14.20; cf. 17.25), the exclusivity of the revelation (14.22; cf. 17.25), intimacy (14.23; cf. 17.24), and a future revelation resulting in love (14.21; cf. 17.26). The parallels may be seen more easily in a chart:

Theme	John 14.18-24	John 17.20-26
Mutual Indwelling	14.20: ...I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you	17.21 (cf. vv.23, 26) "As you, Father, are in me and I in you, so may they be in us..."
See Jesus	14.19: You will see me	17.24: I desire that...they may see my glory
Knowledge about Jesus	14.20: You will <i>know</i> that I am in the Father...	17.25: These <i>know</i> that you sent me
Exclusive Revelation	14.22: ...you will manifest yourself (Jesus) to us and not to the world	17.25: The world does not know you (Father), but...these know that you sent me
Intimacy	14.23: We will come to him and make our home with him	17.24: that where I am, they also may be with me
Revelation & Love	14.21: ...he will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and manifest <i>myself</i> to him	17.26: I will make [your <i>name</i>] known to them, that the love with which you loved me may be in them, and I in them

Father and Son, and the indwelling Spirit. John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 437-445.

⁷⁸ Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3:98-101, 232, 236-238. Idem, "Eschatology in the Johannine Circle," 55-81. Although the dominant emphasis of the Gospel is on realized eschatology, future eschatology is not eclipsed entirely, but survives in several passages (e.g., 3.36; 5.28-29; 6.39, 40, 44, 54; 12.26, 47-48; 14.2-3; 17.24; 21.22).

⁷⁹ Ibid., 72. Idem, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3: 235-236.

⁸⁰ I agree with Frey that John retains a traditional "future" eschatology in his Gospel, *pace* those who defend a whole "realized" eschatology in GJohn. E.g., Hans-Christian Kammler, *Christologie und Eschatologie: Joh 5,17-30 als Schlüsseltext johanneischer Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). However, it is difficult to identify the future Name-revelation solely with a traditional future *parousia*. It may include this, but seems also to refer to the ongoing experience of believers in the present of Jesus through the Paraclete.

The repetitions of 14.18-24 in 17.20-26 encourage readers to read the passages in light of each other, and suggest that the promise of Name-revelation is summative of Jesus' promised self-disclosure to the disciples.

The promise of future revelation should also include reference to the role of the Paraclete. Based on an analysis of the use of ἀναγγέλλω in *Theodotion's* Daniel and other Jewish apocalyptic texts, and the context of 16.12-15, Catrin Williams has argued persuasively that the “declaring” (ἀναγγέλλω) work of the Paraclete in 16.13-15 should be distinguished from his role of “reminding” (ὑπομνήσκω) believers of Jesus' words (14.26). In “declaring,” the Paraclete does not interpret previous information, but reveals something new.⁸¹ Perhaps this new revelation, likewise, is gathered up in the promise of future Name-revelation, or indeed perhaps future Name-revelation is perpetuated through the Paraclete. Schnackenburg may be correct in his suggestion that the past and future Name-revelation of 17.26 represents a “dialectical tension” between Jesus' earthly revelation and the future work of the Paraclete.⁸²

In addition, readers could be tempted to regard John's resurrection narrative as, in some way, reflecting the first instance of the promised future Name-revelation. Although Jesus' promise to reveal himself to his disciples (14.21) and that they would see him (16.16-22) may not be exhausted by his resurrection appearances, it certainly includes them. Thus insofar as Jesus' Name-revelation gathers up these promises, it at least includes his resurrection appearances:

14.21 ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἑμαυτόν

21.1 ἐφανερώσεν ἑαυτὸν...τοῖς μαθηταῖς

17.26 καὶ γνωρίσω [αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου]

This link is supported by the striking use of the implicit referent of the Name in John's resurrection narrative, i.e., the articular ὁ κύριος. In GJohn, there is a marked distinction between the deferential use of κύριος before Jesus' passion,⁸³ and the confessional use in the resurrection

⁸¹ Catrin H. Williams, "Unveiling Revelation: The Spirit-Paraclete and Apocalyptic Disclosure in the Gospel of John," in *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*, ed. Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 122. Pace Barrett, "Christocentric or Theocentric," 6; Sadananda, *Johannine Exegesis of God*, 271-272.

⁸² Schnackenburg, III: 196. He aligns future Name-revelation with the “reminding” role of the Paraclete. If Williams is correct, however, it is more plausible that future Name-revelation reflects the future *revelation* of the Paraclete.

⁸³ Prior to John 20, most uses of κύριος are in the vocative, and best translated as “sir.” John 4.11, 15, 19; 5.7; 6.34, 68; 9.36, 38; 11.3, 12, 21, 27, 32, 34, 39; 12.21; 13.6, 9, 25, 36, 37; 14.5, 8, 22; 20.15; 21.15-17, 20-21. The sole exceptions to this are Jesus' claim to being master (13.13-14), and citations from Isaiah and Psalm 117[118] (1.23; 12.13, 38), as well as two asides (6.23; 11.2). There may be a third aside in 4.1, in which ὁ κύριός is

appearances, beginning with Mary: “I have seen *the Lord*” (20.18), echoed by the disciples: “We have seen *the Lord*” (20.25), and climaxing in Thomas’ confession: “*My Lord and my God*” (20.28).⁸⁴ John’s interpretation of Isaiah 6.1 εἶδον τὸν κύριον as a vision of Jesus’ glory (12.41) indicates that the claim to see “the Lord” in John 20 is confessional. But it may furthermore imply an important relationship between Jesus and the Septuagintal rendering of the Tetragrammaton. Several observations support this implication.⁸⁵ First, the corresponding confession “we beheld his glory” (1.14) alludes to a text featuring the proclamation of the Name (Exod 34.5-7). In addition, John regards Jesus as the referent of ὁ κύριος in the citation of Isaiah 40.3, since it is Jesus’ own way from and to the Father (cf. 8.14; 16.28) to which the Baptizer testifies (1.23).⁸⁶ Furthermore, Jesus is explicitly given the Name (17.11-12). Moreover, Thomas’ confession of Jesus as both Lord and God may reflect John’s familiarity with the Jewish tradition in which the two names YHWH/κύριος and Elohim/θεός represented the divine attributes of judging power and creative or merciful power.⁸⁷

well attested (P66 P75 A B C L W Ψ). Bultmann suggests variants with ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Σ D Θ) are correcting a gloss to bring the text into line with “Johannine usage.” Bultmann, 176, n.2; also Lindars, 177. But it is more likely that ὁ Ἰησοῦς was later altered to ὁ κύριος to avoid the clumsy repetition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς in 4.1. There is no indication that the application of κύριος to Jesus by characters in the narrative prior to John 20 is confessional, *pace* Collins, who gives no reason for his assertion that the vocative κύριε is confessional. Raymond F. Collins, “‘You Call Me Teacher and Lord - and You are Right. For That is What I Am’ (John 13.13),” in *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology*, ed. Geert van Oyen et. al. (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 337-342.

⁸⁴ Mary also uses the articular τὸν κύριον in 20.2, 11. Both here and in the claims of 20.18, 25 (cf. 21.7), the characters speak more than they know, but this should not distract from the confessional significance of their claim in the context of the Gospel, *pace* Carson, 645-646. Brown suggests that here John uses the title which became the faith expression of the community. Brown, II: 984. Similarly Bultmann, 683, n.11; 685, n.9; 689, n.2. Most scholars agree that Thomas’ confession in particular marks a theological climax of the Gospel, in which ὁ κύριος is cultic alongside ὁ θεός, reflecting the Septuagintal rendering of יהוה. E.g., Brown, II: 1047; Barrett, 573; Lindars, 614-616; Keener, II: 1211; *pace* Dodd, who distinguishes the titles as referring to the historical Jesus (ὁ κύριος) and his theological status (ὁ θεός). Dodd, *Interpretation*, 430, n.2. The parallels to Thomas’ confession in pagan religious literature are well known, such as the designation of Domitian as *dominus et deus noster* (“our lord and god”). Suetonius, *Domitian* 13 (Rolfe, LCL). Yet the implications of this parallel are not John’s chief interest: “Thomas’ confession is not so much a counterblast to the conceit of a Roman emperor as a summary of the Gospel as a whole.” Lindars, 616. Similarly Brown, II: 1047.

⁸⁵ *Pace* Schnackenburg, who doubts the post-resurrection confessions reflect the transfer of the ὁ κύριος title to Jesus but simply emerge from the resurrection claim “I have seen the Lord” (20.18; cf. 1 Cor 9.1). Schnackenburg, III: 475, n.110.

⁸⁶ Williams, “Isaiah in John’s Gospel,” 104.

⁸⁷ Rösel points out a tendency of the Greek translators of the Pentateuch to render יהוה as κύριος when God is acting with mercy, and θεός when he acts in judgment or with power. Rösel, “The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name,” 419-425. In rabbinic tradition, the two powers or manifestations of God—his mercy and justice—were identified with the names יהוה and אלהים (respectively, e.g., Sifre Deut § 27). Philo has a similar conception, only reversed: He identifies God’s creative or merciful power with θεός, and his authoritative, sovereign, or just power with κύριος (see *Cher.* 9.27-28, *Sacr.* 15.59; *Abr.* 25.124-125, *QE* 2.68;

It may not be coincidental, then, that Thomas recognizes Jesus as κύριος at the moment when he exercises his authority (ἐξουσία) to take up his own life (10.18). Thus the post-resurrection confession ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον identifies Jesus with the divine Name. And it is reasonable to conclude that this confession was elicited by the resurrected Jesus because, for John, Jesus' resurrection appearances were a narrative expression of his promise to reveal the divine Name (17.26b).

If this is the case, it is instructive to note that the resurrection account functions like the promise of Name-revelation to comfort future believers by underscoring the promise that Jesus continues to be present with and at work through them. Mary is exhorted not to hold on to Jesus, and Thomas must learn that he has no need to touch Jesus, because Jesus intends to be present with them in a non-bodily way—through the Spirit, as he promised.⁸⁸ And throughout the narrative, the vision of the risen Jesus is accompanied by encouragements to those who were not present (20.18, 25, 29), and centers on the giving of the Spirit (20.22). All this encourages future believers that they too participate in the eschatological mission begun by the earthly mission of Jesus. The promise of future Name-revelation begins with the resurrection appearances, but extends beyond these to encompass the continued revelatory mission of Jesus to future believers.

In sum, within the promise of future Name-revelation, the Name itself functions to gather up and summarize much of what is promised to future believers in the Farewell Discourse: Jesus' resurrection appearances, his self-disclosure and indwelling presence, and the Paraclete. Moreover, it functions to assure believers that they participate in Jesus' ongoing eschatological mission. For John, the concept of divine Name-revelation aptly characterizes not only Jesus' earthly mission, but also the era of later believers. This means both that later believers are included in the era of divine Name-revelation, and that future revelation should ultimately be understood in terms of the divine Name.

similar in the *Mekhilta*). See discussion in Segal, *Two Powers*, 39, 173-181. Also Jerome Neyrey, " 'My Lord and my God': The Heavenly Character of Jesus in John's Gospel," in *The Gospel of John in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 448-449. Relatedly, the use of ὁ for the vocative, not ὦ, in Thomas' confession ὁ κύριος μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου may reflect the articular Semitic vocative, and thus underscore a connection to the LXX divine Name (e.g., Ps 29[30].3; 34[35].23; 87.2[88.1]; 85[86].15). Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 58.

⁸⁸ Dorothy A. Lee, "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20," *JSNT* 58 (1995): 43-44.

Meaning

The summative function of the Name in 17.26b has implications for the *meaning* of the Name here. In one respect, this future Name-revelation means the revelation of Jesus. As noted above, the revelation of 14.18-24, which is focused on Jesus himself (vv.19, 21-22), is echoed in 17.20-26 with a significant variation: Name-revelation has taken the place of Jesus' self-revelation. Similarly, insofar as the beginning of future Name-revelation is represented by the resurrection narrative, it features the appearance of the risen Jesus.

However, it is inadequate to conclude that the Name simply means "Jesus."⁸⁹ For one thing, it is not clear that the vision of the risen "Lord" identifies Jesus as bearer of the name ὁ κύριος to the *exclusion* of the Father. It is more likely that, for John, to see the risen Jesus is to see "the Lord" in the same way as to see Jesus is to see the Father (14.9). Furthermore, it was suggested earlier that future Name-revelation may be conveyed, in part, through the Paraclete. Although the Paraclete mediates revelation from Jesus, he does so only because Jesus shares in "all the Father has" (16.15). This mediated revelation glorifies Jesus (16.14) only because it reflects Jesus' relationship to the Father. Consequently, a future Name-revelation mediated by the Paraclete would consist of the revelation that the Father is seen and known in the Son. It seems, instead, that future Name-revelation means the revelation of Jesus' relationship with the Father.

This accords with the immediate context of 17.24-26. On the one hand, Jesus' promise to reveal the Name could correspond to his hope that believers would "see my glory" (17.24), since the glory is given him out of divine love, which in turn is communicated to believers through the revelation of the Name, not glory as we might expect. Yet, on the other hand, it seems to communicate either knowledge or experience of the divine love shared between Father and Son: "...and I will make [your Name] known, so that (ἵνα) the love with which you loved me may be in them..." (17.26). Presumably, divine love is communicated by the Name-revelation because the Name itself means the love relation between Father and Son.

The reference to divine love, in turn, suggests that the revelation of the Name character, "grace and truth," which is embodied in Jesus' mission generally, and particularly in the ultimate expression of divine love on the cross, is perpetuated in the future Name-revelation. Just as Jesus' earthly mission disclosed divine character and embodied divine action, the future Name-

⁸⁹ Pace Appold, who argues that the content of revelation in John 17 is Jesus. Appold, *Oneness*, 229.

revelation does not merely disclose, but also communicates divine love to believers.⁹⁰ Thus the Name means the relationship shared by Father and Son, which is expressed through the communication of divine love through the Son.⁹¹

Significance

It is a short step from this meaning to conclude, again, that John regarded the divine Name category as essentially associative in significance. It is the Father's Name that Jesus reveals, but in doing so, he reveals himself, and indeed the relationship he shares with the Father. The Name communicates the love shared between Father and Son (17.26) precisely because the Name is fundamentally associative.

In addition, John regards the Name as eschatological. Earlier, it was argued that the promise of future Name-revelation shares the same comforting function as other promises made to believers in the Farewell Discourse. The concern undergirding the Farewell Discourse, and crystallized in 17.20-26 is later generation(s) of believers who may have felt distant from the eschatological climax represented by Jesus' earthly mission and exaltation. John extends that climax to include his own time and beyond. Just as the eschatological hour has come and is coming, so eschatological divine Name-revelation has occurred and will yet occur. Believers can be confident that their experience of *Jesus* constitutes *divine* revelation precisely because it is the revelation of the Name which entails both the Father and Son. Moreover, the continuity of future and completed Name-revelation assures believers that they live in the same era of eschatological Name-revelation which began with Jesus' hour.

This is reinforced by two observations. First, the future revelation(s) promised in John 14 and 16, of which 17.26 is a summary, are themselves presented in eschatological terms.⁹² The expression ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (14.19-20) in particular confers upon this era eschatological significance: "It is significant that eschatological language is borrowed to describe these events

⁹⁰ Schnackenburg, III: 197. Similarly Lincoln, "God's Name, Jesus' Name," 170.

⁹¹ Related to this, the rejection of *Jesus* indicates the absence of divine love in 5.42-43. Therefore, if believers are indwelt by divine love because they received the Name-revelation (17.26), it follows that Jesus himself is intrinsic to the Name revealed.

⁹² It is certainly possible that these passages represent two parallel traditions of the same discourse. As in 14.19, Jesus promises that in "a little while you will see me" (16.16). The future revelation promised in 14.19-22 is echoed by the promise of future revelation from Jesus through the Paraclete (16.14-15) and Jesus' own "plain" speaking about the Father (16.25). Moreover, the revelation is restricted to those who have responded appropriately to Jesus, who consequently are loved by the Father (14.21; 16.27).

which fall within the time-sequence: they are events of eternal quality and significance.”⁹³ This “day” begins with Jesus’ resurrection, in ἔτι μικρόν (16.16-19).⁹⁴ This is the era in which the Paraclete communicates new revelation to believers, and the coming hour in which Jesus will speak plainly (παρρησιᾶ) of the Father (16.25).⁹⁵ Both passages indicate that the period of eschatological new revelation is not exhausted by Jesus’ earthly mission, but carries on into the post-resurrection era. This is summarized in Jesus’ claim “I made your name known to them, and I will make it known” (17.26).

Second, the repetition of 12.28 in 17.26, noted earlier, suggests the eschatological significance of the former text may apply similarly to the latter:

καὶ ἐδόξασα [τὸ ὄνομα] καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω (12.28)

καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω (17.26)

The glorification of the Name is clearly identified at the climax of Jesus’ eschatological hour. By implication, both the future Name-glorification and Jesus’ parallel promise of future Name-revelation extend this “hour” into the future. The significance of the Name is bound up with the hour in which it is revealed.

Summary

In summary, the divine Name *functions* to legitimate Jesus and his mission in 12.28, and in 17.6, 26 as summative of Jesus’ revelatory mission—both completed and promised—in order to comfort believers that Jesus’ mission constitutes a disclosure of the divine Name, which continues into the future. Furthermore, the Name *means* both the Father and the Son as they are disclosed in the earthly mission of Jesus in 12.28, the embodiment of Exodus 34 divine Name character in the mission of the Son in 17.6, and the experience of the risen Jesus and communication of divine love in the Son in 17.26b. All three passages reinforce the point that the Name means *that* the Father is disclosed in the Son.

⁹³ Barrett, 464; similarly Schnackenburg, III: 79. “On that day” typically refers to the eschatological day, or “day of the Lord” in the prophets (see, e.g., Isa 2.11; Jer 31.29).

⁹⁴ A parallel passage in 16.16-22 uses the same two expressions: Μικρόν (16.16) and ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (16.23); but it adds that “that day” will mark the beginning of praying in Jesus’ name, and thus must begin at Jesus’ resurrection, not at the final *parousia*.

⁹⁵ The Paraclete will declare (ἀναγγελεῖ) new revelation to believers (16.14), and Jesus will speak (ἀπαγγελεῖ) plainly of the Father 16.25.

This leads to the conclusion that John regarded the divine Name category as essentially associative and eschatological in *significance*. The divine Name legitimates Jesus and comforts believers that they experience divine revelation in Jesus because the Name entails both Father and Son. It is associative. In addition, John locates the Name as the summary of Jesus' entire mission at the climax of his eschatological hour because the Name was, for him, fundamentally eschatological. John extends this eschatological climax into the post-resurrection era with the twin summative promises "I will glorify [my Name]" (12.28) and "I will make [your Name] known" (17.26).

Impetus

In the foregoing discussion, that which makes the divine Name a *significant* category for John was isolated from the meaning and function of the Name in 12.28, 17.6, 26. John exhibits such interest in the divine Name because he identified it with eschatological expectation and regarded it as associative. Although several background influences have undoubtedly contributed to John's divine Name concept, particularly at the level of function and meaning, the associative and eschatological significance of the Name in GJohn provides an important key for identifying what may have functioned as the primary impetus for his interest in the divine Name category. In what follows, various possible background influences will be considered before it is concluded that Isaiah played a key role in generating John's interest in the divine Name category.

Early Christian Tradition

a) διαγγέλλω/ἀπαγγέλλω

Within early Christian tradition, the only expressions comparable in form and content to Jesus' claim to Name-revelation feature "proclaiming" the divine Name: διαγγέλλω in Romans 9.17 and ἀπαγγέλλω in Hebrews 2.12. Both Hebrews 2.12 and Romans 9.17 are citations (Exod 9.16 in Rom 9.17 and Ps 21[22].23 in Heb 2.12). Although the context of Hebrews 2 shares several themes in common with John 17,⁹⁶ the author's interest in the citation is in the reference to brothers and sisters, among whom God is "praised," not a new revelation of the Name. And Paul cites Exodus

⁹⁶ E.g., "glory" in Heb 2.9; John 17.1; *seeing* glory in Heb 2.9; John 17.24; sanctifying believers in Heb 2.11; John 17.17; followers given to Jesus in Heb 2.13; John 17.6, 9; sacrificial death implied in Heb 2.17; John 17.19; and protection from evil in Heb 2.14-15; John 17.15). See Schnackenburg, III: 175.

because it supports his argument about divine mercy. In neither passage does Name-proclamation have the eschatological significance of Jesus' claim in John 17, positioned as it is in the prayer which concludes and summarizes his earthly mission. Nor is Jesus identified with the Name in any way.

b) Synoptics

Although John's direct access to or familiarity with the Synoptics is still a matter of debate,⁹⁷ many scholars rightly recognize in John 12.27-28 the Johannine equivalent of the Synoptic Gethsemane scene. Jesus' prayer, "Father, glorify your Name," likely corresponds to the Synoptic "not what I want, but what you want" (Mk 14.36 and para.; cf. Heb 5.7-9) because John draws upon a similar tradition, or else upon one or more of the Synoptics themselves.⁹⁸ But John has elected to substitute a focus on the divine Name for the divine will. Brown suggests that this represents John's adapting an expression from the Synoptic "Lord's Prayer" to suit his "Gethsemane" scene: "Hallowed be your Name."⁹⁹ This is plausible, since there was a close association in Jewish tradition between sanctifying the divine Name and either fulfilling divine will,¹⁰⁰ or righteous suffering.¹⁰¹ To this, we may add that John's theophanic voice ("I have glorified

⁹⁷ In his helpful survey of scholarship on this question of John's relationship to the Synoptics over the past century, Moody Smith concludes that the question is as open as ever. Dwight Moody Smith, *John among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth Century Research*, 2d ed. (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001). It seems difficult to deny that John or his final editor was familiar at least with Mark. See Richard Bauckham, "John for Readers of Mark," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 147-171. Wendy S. North, "The Anointing in John 12.1-8: A Tale of Two Hypotheses," in *Engaging with C. H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Catrin H. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 216-230. For our purposes, however, a minimalist position is sufficient—that John was at least familiar with traditions which are reflected in the Synoptics.

⁹⁸ In both Mark 13.32-42 and John 12, Jesus' soul (ἡ ψυχὴ μου in Mk 14.33; John 12.27) is troubled; Mark's ἡλθεν ἡ ὥρα (14.41) becomes John's νῦν, and perhaps appears also in John 12.23; and Mark's ἀλλ' οὐ τί... (14.36) becomes John's ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο... (12.27). So, some conclude that John knew and drew upon Mark here. E.g., Bultmann, 428, n.1. Barrett, 424-425. Brown suggests John may draw on Matthew 26.42. Brown, I: 476. Although, earlier he had regarded GJohn as representing an independent witness tradition. Raymond Brown, "Incidents That Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 143-148. Dodd maintains John has independent access to the same tradition. C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 69-71. Idem, *Interpretation*, 373. Similarly, Lindars, 430-431; Moody-Smith, 239; Carson, 440.

⁹⁹ Brown, I: 476; also Lindars, 431. John evinces familiarity in chapter 17 with the so-called Lord's Prayer (reflected in Matt 6.9-10). See n.106.

¹⁰⁰ The hallowing or profaning of God's name is inextricably linked with his will being done on earth by his people (Ezek 20.27; 36.23; Am 2.7; 4Q427 frag. 7 col I 1.15-16; cf. 4Q177 col IV 1.15). This is explicit in the rabbinic *Qiddush ha-Shem*: "When the Israelites do the will of God His name becomes renowned in

it and I will glorify it again”) functions similarly to the voice that speaks at the Baptism: “You are my son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased” (Mk 1.11; cf. Matt 2.17; Lk 3.22), or perhaps the Transfiguration scene (Mk 9.7 and parallels).¹⁰² It is plausible that the primary source for John 12.27-28 is the tradition reflected in the Synoptic Gethsemane scene, perhaps in combination with the “Lord’s prayer” and theophanic voice traditions.¹⁰³

A similar case can be made for John 17. Due to the placement of Jesus’ prayer on the cusp of Jesus’ passion, some scholars suggest it is the equivalent of Jesus’ Gethsemane prayer in the Synoptics.¹⁰⁴ And if both Johannine prayers (12.28; 17.1-26) are taken together, the agony and obedience of Jesus reflected in the Synoptic Gethsemane prayer are represented.¹⁰⁵ There are also indications that John 17 is roughly patterned on the “Lord’s prayer” which appears in Matthew and Luke. The Matthean version in particular (Matt 6.9-10), like John 17, addresses God as “Father,” and shows interest in consecration language, God’s will, the divine Name, and deliverance from evil.¹⁰⁶ Corresponding to the two petitions “hallowed be your name” and “your will be done on earth as in heaven,” are Jesus’ petition, “Glorify your son” (17.1) and his two claims, “I glorified you on earth by completing the work you have given me to do” (17.4) and “I made your

the world...But when the Israelites fail to do the will of God, His name becomes profaned in the world...” Mek. Exod 15.2. Translation from *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael*, vol. 2, trans. Jacob Lauterbach (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933), 28-29.

¹⁰¹ Matthew implicitly links the Lord’s prayer γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου (Matt 6.10) with Jesus’ death (Matt 26.42). And the divine Name was central to the rabbinic concept of martyrdom, which was often referred to as the “sanctification of the Name.” E.g., t. Ber. 4.18; b. Zebah. 115b; b. Pesah. 53b.

¹⁰² Bultmann suggests the latter. Bultmann, 428, n.1.

¹⁰³ Brown suggests that John 12 may even be closer to Jesus’ original prayer and its setting than the “more organized” Synoptic scene, which may have drawn on *known* prayers of Jesus to fill in the skeleton of his solitary Gethsemane vigil (Brown, I: 471). However, *pace* Brown, John 12.28 is distinctively Johannine, fitted into the broader network of passages that feature the divine Name. Although it is possible that this goes directly back to an independent witness tradition, it is perhaps more likely to be the result of Johannine reflection upon his source(s) and/or experience(s).

¹⁰⁴ Lindars, 515. Barrett, 500.

¹⁰⁵ Carson, 552. This may satisfy Brown’s concern that Jesus’ sorrow in Gethsemane looks nothing like the confidence of John 17. Brown, II: 748.

¹⁰⁶ Some are confident of John’s dependence on Matthew. E.g., William O. Walker, “The Lord’s Prayer in Matthew and in John,” *NTS* 28 (1982): 239. Wolfgang Schenk, “Die um-Codierungen der Matthäishcen unser-Vater-Redaktion in Joh 17,” in *John and the Synoptics*, ed. Adelbert Denaux (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 587-607. This is difficult to defend, but most would agree with Dodd’s suggestion that, at minimum, Matthew and John draw on a common tradition, which was widespread enough to appear in some form in “Q” and in *Didache* 7—8. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 333-334. Cf. Brown, II: 747.

Name known..." (17.6). It seems that the traditions preserved in both the Synoptic "Lord's Prayer" and Gethsemane prayer have contributed to both John 12.28 and 17.1-26.

However, as with all of his source material, John has distinctively re-worked this tradition in a way that merits our attention. First, in 12.28, John has "Father, glorify your Name," not "your will be done" or "hallowed be your name." Either of the latter phrases would have accorded well with John's emphases elsewhere on Jesus' relation to the divine will,¹⁰⁷ or use of sanctification language (ἀγιάζω).¹⁰⁸ So it is insufficient to suggest that John altered the tradition to "glorify your Name" simply because the expression was common.¹⁰⁹ Rather, by using ὄνομα, not θέλημα, John identifies the divine Name at the heart of the divine plan. And by using δοξάζω, not ἀγιάζω, John locates the divine Name in the theme of glory, which pervades GJohn.

Second, whereas the association between Jesus' death and the "hallowing" of God's Name is only implicit in the Synoptics,¹¹⁰ John ties the glorification of the Name directly to Jesus' hour of death and departure: "The hour has come...for this, I came to this hour. Father, glorify your Name" (12.20, 27-28). Similarly, whereas the Synoptic prayer "hallowed be your Name," is to be of perpetual concern,¹¹¹ the petition for Name-glorification in John 12.28, by contrast, is timed to coincide with the event(s) of Jesus' hour.¹¹²

Third, Jesus' petition for Name-glorification is granted additional prominence by the response of a theophanic voice: "I have glorified [my Name] and I will glorify [it] again" (12.28b). Regardless of whether this represents the influence of the Synoptic voice, "This is my beloved son," or perhaps more generally the *Bat Qol* tradition, John has adapted it to feature the divine Name.¹¹³ To assimilate this appearance of God on the scene with the emphasis elsewhere that no

¹⁰⁷ Jesus is repeatedly presented as one who comes to do God's will (John 4.34; 5.30; 6.38-40; 7.17; 9.31), and explicitly in his death (10.17-18; 12.27).

¹⁰⁸ In GJohn, Jesus claims to be sanctified (10.35) and to have sanctified himself (17.19).

¹⁰⁹ The expression is ubiquitous in Jewish tradition. See, e.g., Ps 85[86].9, 12; Isa 24.15; 42.10; 66.5; Mal 1.11; Mal 2.2; Pss. Sol. 10.7; 17.5; 1 En. 61.9, 12; 63.7; 69.24; 2 Bar 67.3; the *Kaddish* (see n.178).

¹¹⁰ See n.101.

¹¹¹ This is implied by the participle προσευχόμενοι in Matthew 6.7: "when you are praying" and by the preceding ὅταν in Luke 11.2 "whenever you pray."

¹¹² This interest in a specific present moment of Name-glorification is not explicitly found anywhere else in the NT or Apostolic Fathers. The reference in 1 Clement 43.6 is to Abraham's context.

¹¹³ Many commentators identify the heavenly voice with the *Bat Qol* tradition which appears regularly in later rabbinic materials. E.g., Brown, I: 468; Keener, II: 876. For references to *Bat Qol* in the rabbis, see Keener, II: 876, n.79.

one has or can see or hear the Father apart from Jesus (1.18; 5.37; 14.6), John describes the ambiguous effect of the voice on the crowd: “The crowd...said it was thunder; others said ‘An angel has spoken to him’ ” (12.29). Like the Jews in 5.37, the crowd does not “hear his voice.” It seems, then, that John labours to retain the tradition primarily for its rhetorical effect on readers, who, unlike the crowd, do understand the voice. Consequently, the voice underscores for readers that Jesus’ coming is ultimately about the glorification of the divine Name.

John’s re-working of tradition in chapter 17 discloses a similarly distinctive series of emphases. The context of John 17 would have been well-suited for Jesus to have claimed, either “I hallowed your Name” or even echoing 12.28, “I glorified your Name.” Yet here Jesus makes a much more radical claim: “I have made your Name known.” Although the hallowing of the Name is only indirectly associated with Jesus, his mission, or death in the Synoptics, in John 17, Jesus’ entire mission is characterized by the Name. Conversely, the Name has a temporal significance in John 17, tied as it is to Jesus’ mission, and the arrival of the “hour” (17.1; cf. 12.23, 28).¹¹⁴ And perhaps most striking, the idea of Name-revelation itself is entirely absent from the Synoptics, and Jesus’ claim to reveal the Name himself on behalf of the Father is utterly unprecedented in Synoptic (or indeed all Jewish) tradition.

c) *Didache*

Although John’s distinctive Name-revelation cannot be explained solely on the basis of the “Lord’s Prayer” tradition, it is intriguing that the Didachist, who knew the same tradition (Did. 8.2), hints at a similar idea.¹¹⁵ Since the prayer appears in *Didache* 8.2, it may also have informed the eucharistic liturgy of *Didache* 10.1-2, 5:

And after you are satisfied [i.e., from the eucharist meal], give thanks in this way: “We give you thanks, Holy Father, for your holy name, which you caused to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge, faith, and immortality that you made known to us through Jesus, your servant. To you be glory forever...deliver [your Church] from all evil.”¹¹⁶

At the same time, *Didache* 7-10 shares many similar themes with John 17, including the holiness of the Father (Did. 9.2; cf. John 17.11), the divine Name (Did. 10.2-3), divine glory (Did. 9.2-4; 10.2, 4-5),

¹¹⁴ For more on Jesus’ mission, see n.20.

¹¹⁵ *Didache* seems to belong to the same “milieu” as Matthew and possibly James, and is most likely dated from anywhere between 50-150AD. See *The Apostolic Fathers*, 3rd ed., trans. Michael Holmes (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 337-338.

¹¹⁶ Text of the *Apostolic Fathers* taken from *ibid.* All translations are my own.

and petitions for the unity of the church in love, her holiness, and deliverance from evil (10.5).¹¹⁷ Most significantly, the phrase τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν likely signifies the reception of divine revelation communicated through Jesus, which in turn is represented by ingesting the eucharistic elements of cup and bread. *Didache* 10.2 follows the same liturgical formula as the prayers in chapter 9: (1) thanks to God, (2) for a gift which is revealed (3) through Jesus (4) followed by a doxology. Within this pattern, and in the context of γνώσις language (ἐγνώρισας in 9.2, 3; 10.2; γνώσεως in 9.3; 10.2), it would be natural to read “your name” as among the gifts which are revealed *through* Jesus.¹¹⁸ The connotation here is roughly parallel to the Name-revelation of John 17.6.

However, the language differs between the texts, and any associative or eschatological significance attached to the Name in *Didache* is subtle, if present at all. Furthermore, it is impossible to know whether the Didachist influenced John (or vice versa).¹¹⁹ At best, perhaps these authors drew upon similar influences in their adaptation of Synoptic prayer traditions.

In sum, John has uniquely adapted Gethsemane, prayer, and theophanic voice traditions reflected in the Synoptics to foreground the divine Name in the context of Jesus’ eschatological hour. Jesus himself is distinctively bound up with the Name as both are “glorified” in the hour, and as Jesus himself reveals the Name. These are precisely the features which mark the divine Name as associative and eschatological in significance. Thus we must look beyond early Christian tradition for the impetus for John’s use of Name language in these passages.

Name Angel Traditions

As noted in the Introduction, some scholars have proposed that John is indebted to Jewish traditions in which an angelic figure bears the divine Name. Relevant to the current discussion is the idea reflected in some of these traditions that the angel is personified as “the

¹¹⁷ See Brown, II: 746.

¹¹⁸ Thus the meaning of the expression distinguishes it from John’s otherwise linguistically similar “the word...dwelt among us” (1.14) or “your name, which you gave me” (17.11), *pace* Schnackenburg, who points out the parallel between Did. 10.2 and John 17.11. Schnackenburg, III: 436, n.41. Whereas Jesus *is* the *Logos*, he reveals the Name he is given.

¹¹⁹ Schnackenburg, I: 197-198. Despite parallels between *Didache* 9-10 and John 17, Brown observes that John 17 lacks the clear eucharistic focus of the prayer in *Didache*. Brown, II: 746-747.

Name,¹²⁰ as well as two texts in particular in which an angelic figure is associated in some way with the revelation of the Name.¹²¹

a) Personified "Name"

Jarl Fossum argues that the equation of Jesus with the Name implied by the similarity of expression in 12.28 ("Glorify your Name") and 12.23 ("...son of man to be glorified") indicates that John regarded Jesus himself as the Name.¹²² Similarly, he suggests that the close relationship between τὸν λόγον and τὸ ὄνομα in John 17.6 reflects the idea that both Name and Word are personifications.¹²³ By implication, Jewish traditions featuring a personified Name figure have led to John's use of the Name glorified in 12.28 and revealed in 17.6 to designate Jesus himself.

This proposal has two weaknesses. First, the personified Name is less ubiquitous in Jewish tradition than Fossum assumes. Too hastily does he assume that references to the Name tabernacling in the Temple indicate a "personified" Name,¹²⁴ or that Yahoel *is* the Name because his own name is theophoric.¹²⁵ Second, Fossum's proposal glosses over some of the key features of John's presentation of the Name. Although Jesus is identified explicitly as the *Logos*, John nowhere identifies him *as* the Name. Fossum's attempt to ground his assertion that Jesus *is* the Name in the similarity between 12.28 and 12.23 (cf. 17.1) does not adequately account for the deliberate ambiguity that John seeks to maintain in the juxtaposition of these two passages. It flattens the text to suggest that the phrase "glorify your Name" means merely "glorify me (i.e., Jesus)" as if Jesus *is* the Name. It was observed above that the Name in 12.28 has a profoundly associative significance, wherein there is an intended ambiguity between the objects of glorification. Rather than identifying Jesus as a hypostatic Name, distinct from God, John uses the

¹²⁰ This seems clear in Philo's *Conf.* 146 (see discussion in chapter 3).

¹²¹ Discussion of several texts featuring a Name-angel will be deferred to the discussion of Name-giving in the following chapter.

¹²² Fossum, "Onomanology," 126. Similarly Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 272; Idem., "The Name of Son of Man," 246. Fossum incorrectly cites Dodd as a supporter of this reading. Fossum, "Onomanology," 126, n.75.

¹²³ He points to Revelation 19, where ὁ λόγος is a name. Fossum, "Onomanology," 126. In this, Fossum echoes Quispel, who suggests that here they are "interchangeable, and in a way, identical." Quispel, "Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity," 150. Cf. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 275-276.

¹²⁴ Jer 7.12; Ezra 6.12; Neh 1.9; Pss. Sol. 7.6.

¹²⁵ Fossum, "Onomonology," 121, 123-124.

Name as a concept with which two figures are equally identified. Name-glorification encompasses the glory of *both* the Son and the Father.

b) *Joseph & Aseneth*

In what is most likely the earliest version of the story, *Joseph and Aseneth*,¹²⁶ the heaven is “torn apart” and a man comes “from heaven” as the agent of Aseneth’s transformation, bearing a hidden name which he refuses to disclose:

Why do you seek this, my name, Aseneth? My name is in the heavens in the book before all, because I am chief of the house of the Most High (15.12).

Central to the scene is the secret name.¹²⁷ Several scholars suggest the figure here must be the angel of Exodus 23.30 who bears the divine Name.¹²⁸ However, this is by no means clear. No connection is made between the angel’s secret name and the divine Name, which is featured explicitly earlier in the narrative,¹²⁹ and the significance of the angel’s name is diluted by what follows:

And *all the names* written in the book of the Most High are unspeakable, and man is not allowed to pronounce nor hear them in this world, because those names are exceedingly great and wonderful and laudable (15.12).

Moreover, a parallel is drawn between the angel’s name, which is recorded “by the finger of God” in “the beginning of the book [of the Most High] before all (the others)” (15.12), and Aseneth’s name, similarly recorded “by my finger” in the “beginning of the book [of the living of heaven], as the very first of all” (15.4). Edith Humphrey rightly cautions that the revelatory scene perhaps

¹²⁶ See helpful discussion of the four major text families and the debate over the primacy of the shorter “d” text (Philonenko) or longer “b” text (Burchard) in Edith M. Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 17-27. Humphrey argues convincingly for the primacy of the longer “b” reading, which was probably composed in Greek, and dating from the first century BC or AD. The angelic refusal is present in the earliest version, *pace* Stuckenbruck. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God’: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 55. Translation taken from “Joseph and Aseneth,” trans. C. Burchard, in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 202-247.

¹²⁷ Humphrey points out that, in the early “longer” version, a chiasm in chapters 14-17 focuses attention on the central revelatory section in which the discussion of the angel’s name provides “the structural core.” Humphrey, *Aseneth*, 23; also p.100.

¹²⁸ Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 112. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 129-131.

¹²⁹ Aseneth is afraid to “name the Name of God” (11.15). But she summons the courage to invoke his Name (11.18), and addresses him as “Lord” in chapters 12—13.

cannot be fully decoded, and that the core of the revelation may be simply that this figure is mysterious. The name, by virtue of remaining undisclosed, appears to signify or connote this mystery.¹³⁰ And the secrecy in turn serves to redirect Aseneth's curiosity regarding the angel's own identity to the more fundamental point that he is an agent of *God* who writes names in his book. As such, the name might serve implicitly to authorize the angel in some way.

In both *Aseneth* and John 17, a name is featured at the heart of the revelatory experience with a figure of divine origin. For Aseneth, the heaven is “torn apart” and a man with an undisclosed name comes “from heaven” as the agent of her transformation (15.6-7). In GJohn, Jesus is sent “from heaven” to disclose the divine Name, that his followers might believe. These parallel elements may reflect the influence of a common tradition, which would reach full maturity in Jewish mystical traditions, especially Merkabah.¹³¹ Nevertheless, whereas the name connotes mystery in *Aseneth*, the Name revealed in John 17.6 means the character and saving action of the Father expressed in the Son. Moreover, there is no indication in *Aseneth* that the name is shared between God and the angel in any way that includes the angel himself in the revelation. The name is not associative. And, in contrast to the angel whose mission is the transformation of Aseneth in a narrative intended to rehabilitate a patriarchal narrative, Jesus reveals the Name in the climax of a mission that is fundamentally eschatological in significance.

c) 1 *Enoch*

In 1 *Enoch* 69.13-26, Michael refuses to disclose a secret name to the Kesbeel figure. In light of several references hitherto to the “name of the Lord of Spirits,” and the link between the secret name and the Oath,¹³² which sustains creation, the name in question here is most likely the divine Name. The sense here is that Michael has knowledge of the name—i.e., access to creative

¹³⁰ “Always the living quality of a narrative—especially a vision-report—needs to be appreciated, or the images are tamed, as they are translated into propositional or deliberative language.” Humphrey, *Aseneth*, 100.

¹³¹ *Aseneth* lacks the heavenly journey or theurgic elements of a Merkabah text. However, as in the Hekhalot literature, a revelatory experience is the central turning point in Aseneth's transformation. Thus the traditions, which later became Merkabah, likely exerted some influence in its composition. Kanagaraj has argued that John was similarly exposed to proto-mystical traditions. Jey J. Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). See further n.143.

¹³² The link between the Oath and the Name is reinforced if, as Hannah argues, following Black, Dillman and Beer, the words BIQA and 'AKA linked with the Oath are gematria for יהוה האלהים and יהוה אדני respectively. Darrell Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 52. In addition, in rabbinic tradition, “oath of God” refers to the commandment in Exodus 20.7 (Midr. Lev 33.6; Midr. Eccl 8.1).

power—which could potentially be disclosed to Kesbeel. Thus, although Michael's potential to disclose the divine Name bears superficial resemblance to the claim of John 17.6, the name here is numinous in function, and has no relationship to salvation, or to the authorization of Michael for eschatological mission.

¹ Enoch 69 may also imply some relationship between the secret name and the name of the son of man, since the latter name is revealed after the secret name is withheld (69.27; cf. v.14), and revealed to the creation which is sustained by the Oath connected to the secret name. The matured Enochic tradition in 3 Enoch may represent this possibility,¹³³ since the divine Name functions to legitimate the exaltation of the son of man or Metatron figure as the “lesser YHWH.”¹³⁴ If the divine Name does legitimate the son of man in 1 Enoch, it is not unlike the legitimization of Jesus himself in GJohn. Moreover the name category here has an associative significance resembling that of GJohn.¹³⁵ However, this is muted, since the name of the son of man does not appear to acquire intrinsic significance, in contrast to GJohn, where Jesus' name is used in invocation.¹³⁶ Moreover, the legitimization of the Enochic son by the name follows his exaltation, and is not integral to any eschatological mission.

Although the Name Angel traditions discussed above feature some similarities of theme and language with John's Name-glorification and Name-revelation, they fail to account for the associative and eschatological significance of the Name in GJohn, and thus of John's distinctive interest in the divine Name concept.

¹³³ Proposed dates for 3 Enoch range from Odeberg's third century AD to Milik's ninth or tenth century AD date. See “3 Enoch,” trans. Philip Alexander, in *OTP*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 225-229. The text reflects the influence of Hekhalot and the Yahoel figure of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, as well as the Enoch figure of 1 Enoch 71, and 2 Enoch 22. See Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*, 2d ed. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965), 41. Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, “Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition,” *JJS* 43 (1992): esp. p. 24. The text draws upon and reinforces traditions which are very old indeed. Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 110; “3 Enoch,” 229.

¹³⁴ As in Philippians 2.9-11, Metatron receives the Name after his exaltation (3 En. 4-12).

¹³⁵ This is underlined in 3 Enoch: As bearer of the divine Name, the Son/Enoch figure is called the “lesser YHWH” alongside the “greater YHWH” (3 En. 12.5; 48D.1). In an exalted cosmology densely populated by angelic beings, many of whom are called YHWH, the author has no higher category than the divine Name to which he can appeal to distinguish Metatron. Thus he does so by an even closer identification of Metatron with that Name.

¹³⁶ Yet interestingly, in the matured tradition of 3 Enoch, there is no significance attached to the name of this figure himself (Enoch/Metatron).

Targumic Tradition

In discussions of John's prologue, and particularly his *Logos* concept, at least five possible backgrounds are proposed: the OT "word of God," Philo's *Logos*, Jewish wisdom traditions, Jewish angelomorphic traditions, and the targumic *Memra*. One proponent of the latter view, John Ronning, has argued that a targumic background, in turn, sheds light on John's Name concept.

Ronning devotes some attention to exploring what the divine Name is in GJohn, its meaning, and how Jesus "reveals" it in 17.6. He rightly identifies the implied referent of ὄνομα in 17.6 with the Tetragrammaton and Name-revelation with Jesus' mission, and he suggests some relationship exists between the "I am he" sayings of Deutero-Isaiah and GJohn.¹³⁷ But he goes on to propose that these emphases derive from targumic tradition. The fact that Jesus is identified as the *Logos* and also shares the Father's Name suggests to Ronning the influence of passages such as Tg. Ps.-J. Exodus 34.6, which renders the divine Name as "the name of the Word of the LORD."¹³⁸ In addition, the strong resemblance between some targumic renderings of Exodus 3.14 and the designation "he who is and who was" in Revelation 11.17 suggests to Ronning that John was familiar with the association between this expression and the divine Name. This gives him a basis on which to suggest that targumic influence similarly underlies the fact that, in GJohn (as he understands it), the meaning of the divine Name in John 17.6 resides in the "I am" sayings.

Overall, Ronning fails to present a cogent defense of the thesis that John's use of the Name category is indebted to targumic tradition. The appeal to targumic tradition itself is methodologically problematic, since it cannot be demonstrably traced to the first century.¹³⁹ Moreover, Ronning's approach is based entirely on establishing literary links, but he gives little attention to how the Name functions within GJohn itself, or to how John uses the OT. It is not clear, for instance, that the meaning of the Name resides solely in the "I am" sayings. And an appeal to the Targums seems unnecessary, given that the divine Name and "I am" sayings both occur in Isaiah, from which (as Ronning admits) John demonstrably derives his "I am" sayings. Even if targumic influence on the Johannine *Logos* concept were demonstrable, there is little

¹³⁷ Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*, 71, 74-76, 80-81.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 70.

¹³⁹ An Aramaic translation may not have been read alongside the Hebrew until the second century (m. Meg. 4.4-6, 10). See further discussion of the methodological difficulty in using rabbinic sources to interpret NT texts in Catrin H. Williams, "John and the Rabbis Revisited," in *Engaging with C. H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Catrin H. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 107-125.

distinctive to the Targums that could account for the associative or eschatological significance of the Name in GJohn. Thus, Barrett's cautionary claim that the *Memra* is a "blind alley" in the study of the Johannine *Logos* may apply similarly to the question of John's Name concept.¹⁴⁰

Mystical and Magical Traditions

The relationship noted earlier between Name-revelation and the knowledge of God in John 17 bears some resemblance to the widespread view in both Jewish and Christian traditions that the divine Name was unknown or secret. In Jewish circles of the Second Temple period, great restriction was placed on the use of the divine Name, even from being uttered, except by the High Priest at Yom Kippur.¹⁴¹ And both later OT authors (e.g., Job, Ecclesiastes, Esther) and all NT authors either avoided references to God's name YHWH altogether or substituted the Tetragrammaton for circumlocutions such as "the Name" or "Ineffable Name."¹⁴² This restriction contributed to and was matched by a corresponding fascination with the divine Name and its disclosure.

a) Mystical Traditions

Some have argued that GJohn reflects the influence of Jewish mystical or proto-Merkabah traditions.¹⁴³ It is noteworthy, then, that in some Jewish mystical texts, secret names—

¹⁴⁰ Barrett, 97; cf. Keener, I: 349-350.

¹⁴¹ E.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 2.275-276; Philo, *Mos.* 2.114; m. Sotah 7.6; m. Sanh. 7.5; 10.1; Pes. 50a; Midr. Exod 3.7; Midr. Eccl 3.11. This secrecy generated fascination with the "unknown" or "uncertain" god of the Jews in pagan circles. See George H. van Kooten, "Moses/Musaeus/Mochos and His God Yahweh/Iao, and Sabaoth, Seen from Graeco-Roman Perspective," in *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*, ed. George van Kooten (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 130-132.

¹⁴² Cohon, "Name of God," 584-585, 590, n.54-56.

¹⁴³ Kanagaraj identifies several features of Jewish mysticism (primarily Merkabah), which occur, to varying degrees, in GJohn. These include (1) heavenly ascents, (2) *seeing* God on a chariot-throne, (3) visions of fire and light, (4) angelic mediation (ascribed to Jesus in GJohn), (5) visions of a human-like figure, the angelomorphic son of man who represents God as his Agent, (6) salvation and judgment, (7) transformation of the mystic/believer, (8) divine commissioning, (9) communal mysticism, (10) the identification of Name with glory, and (11) esoteric features (like irony, symbols, signs, and misunderstanding) that point to a reality beyond the visible world. Kanagaraj, *Mysticism*, 312-317. Others who have linked GJohn and Merkabah mysticism include Odeberg, Meeks, Borgen, and Dunn. For discussion and bibliography, see *ibid.*, 33-42. Kanagaraj has advanced the best case to date for the influence of Jewish mysticism on GJohn. However, as there is no evidence of Merkabah tradition that antedates the Gospel, we must remain skeptical of the extent to which John might have been influenced by such ideas. At best, he reflects emphases which would occur similarly in the later developed Merkabah tradition.

especially the divine Name—are central to the revelatory experience. In *Hekhalot Zutarti*,¹⁴⁴ the revelation of the divine Name itself is the highest level of mystical experience.¹⁴⁵ Although two bracketing citations of Isaiah 6 might create an expectation for a description of God enthroned, instead the mystic asks “and what is his name,” and provides a list of divine names (*HekhZ* §351). Moses’ ascent to God features the disclosure of divine names by which the mystic may remember Torah (§336), and similarly when Akiba gazes on the Merkabah, a “great”¹⁴⁶ Name” is revealed to him, which can thereafter be “used,” and which he passes on to his students (§337), for their exclusive use (§360). The notion of “secret” divine names implies exclusivity of both revelation and access, since knowledge of secret names was vital for gaining access into ascending levels of heaven.¹⁴⁷ This idea is found similarly in *Hekhalot Rabbati*.¹⁴⁸ Grözinger concludes from such features that the name concept in the Hekhalot literature is fundamentally a “hypostasis of inherent power and function.”¹⁴⁹

For Kanagaraj, GJohn features a Name concept that is esoteric and secret in nature, thus reflecting the influence of such features of mysticism.¹⁵⁰ It is possible that John may have been reacting to the idea of secret names functioning as access keys when he presents Jesus himself as the “way” to the Father (14.6). If so, the identification of Jesus as Name-revealer would grant some legitimacy to this exclusive claim “no one comes to the Father except through me” (14.6).¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁴ Scholem’s defense of the antiquity of the traditions preserved in the Hekhalot literature has been generally accepted. See Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 3rd ed. (New York: Schocken, 1954), esp. 40-79. Idem., *Jewish Gnosticism. Hekhalot Zutarti* is likely the earliest of the five core Hekhalot texts (the others being *Hekhalot Rabbati*, *Ma’aseh Merkabah*, *Merkabah Rabba*, and 3 Enoch), possibly preserving traditions that go back to the first two centuries. Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones and Christopher Rowland, *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 237, 264. Contra Schäfer, who dates them much later, and regards *Hekhalot Rabbati* as earlier. Peter Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 243-245. Text of *Hekhalot Zutarti* from Morray-Jones and Rowland, *Mystery of God*, 274-301.

¹⁴⁵ Kanagaraj, *Mysticism*, 84.

¹⁴⁶ Mss. Munich 22 and New York 8128; but absent from Ms. Oxford 1531.

¹⁴⁷ *HekhZ* § 336c-d, 337, 373, 413-417c.

¹⁴⁸ E.g., §§199, 236, 318-321. Related to this, in rabbinic tradition, Jews gained access to Eden by being inscribed by the divine Name ידש, the letters of which are sealed into the nose, hand, and “place of circumcision.” See Elliot R. Wolfson, “Circumcision and the Divine Name: A Study in the Transmission of Esoteric Doctrine,” *JQR* 78 (1987): 77-112.

¹⁴⁹ Karl Grözinger, “The Names of God and the Celestial Powers: Their Function and Meaning in the Hekhalot Literature,” *JSJT* 6 (1987): 58

¹⁵⁰ Kanagaraj, *Mysticism*, 231-233.

¹⁵¹ See, e.g., Morray-Jones and Rowland, *Mystery of God*, 123-131.

Perhaps somewhat analogously, the Christian mystical text, *Ascension of Isaiah*, like *Hekhalot Zutarti*, has levels of heaven, but avoids the motif of secret names of access, perhaps to highlight the secret names of Jesus and God (Mart. Asc. Isa. 1.17; 7.37; 8.7; 9.5). However, the Name concept itself in GJohn is not esoteric or secret. And in contrast to the mystical notion of a name as a bearer of power, for John, the Name is a fundamentally eschatological and associative concept.

b) Magical Texts

In the Greek Magical Papyri (PGM), various divine names—notably “Iao” and related variations of the divine Name¹⁵²—are often closely guarded and prized for their numinous qualities, similarly to Merkabah.¹⁵³ In one passage, which Heitmüller links to John 17,¹⁵⁴ Name-revelation is associated with esoteric knowledge of God, and perhaps implicitly with the wielding of certain powers. A figure (presumably Moses) addresses God thus: “I am the one whom you met by the holy mountain, and to whom you gave the knowledge of your great n[ame] (ὄν[όματος]), the knowledge of which I will keep sincerely....”¹⁵⁵ George van Kooten notes that the association of the Jewish God with magic was known in pagan circles, and suggests that this reflects the widespread awareness that magical properties were attached to his Name.¹⁵⁶ The function of the Name in these texts is primarily numinous, and there is no hint in these texts of an associative or eschatological significance. So, Dietzfelbinger rightly downplays their significance for John’s Name concept: “Beim Gebrauch von ‘Name Gottes’ in c.17 sind eventuelle magische Vorstellungen tief abgesunken. Wort und Wortgebrauch sind ganz von johanneischem Denken durchdrungen.”¹⁵⁷

¹⁵² For general discussion of the use of variations of the Tetragrammaton in PGM, see Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton*, 172-175.

¹⁵³ E.g., PGM I.216-17; XII.240; XIII.763; XXI.1; LXI.20-27.

¹⁵⁴ Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 207.

¹⁵⁵ PGM XII.92-94. Similarly, in PGM II. 127-128, God is addressed as the one who “gave to me the gift of the knowledge of your great name.” My translations. Text from *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 2 vols., Karl Preisendanz (Leipzig: Verlag und Druck von B. G. Teubner, 1928, 1931). Betz dates both texts to the fourth century AD, rendering them of limited interest to us. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*, ed. Hans Dieter Betz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), xxiii.

¹⁵⁶ Van Kooten, “Moses and Iao,” 132.

¹⁵⁷ Dietzfelbinger, *Abschied des Kommende*, 303.

c) *Corpus Hermeticum*

In the *Corpus Hermeticum*,¹⁵⁸ knowledge of the divine Name was identified with esoteric knowledge or power,¹⁵⁹ and the divine Name concept was of ultimate significance. In *Aesclepius* 21, Trismegistus states that God's Name should capture all that he is "...a few syllables, providing the necessary exchange between human voice and ears." But, he concludes that no single name can capture God. On the one hand, God is all names because there is nothing he is not, and yet, as the maker and Father of all, he is beyond naming, or nameless. The idea of God being unnamable occurs also in *Hermeticum* 5.10 and 14.4.¹⁶⁰

In a prayer that concludes *Aesclepius* (§41), the Name is associated with the knowledge of God:

We thank you, supreme and most high god, by whose grace alone we have attained the light of your knowledge; [namely the?] holy name that must be honored, the one name by which our ancestral faith blesses god alone.... And we who are saved by your power do indeed rejoice because you have shown yourself to us wholly.... We have known you, the vast light perceived only by reason....

In these passages, the Name is a feature of a sort of apophaticism, bearing little resemblance to the eschatologically-grounded Name concept in GJohn.

d) *Gospel of Truth*

A more striking parallel in language may be found between John's Name-revelation concept and the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*, notably 38.23-24, in which the Name of the Father "is apparent through a son."¹⁶¹ Untergassmair points out that, within the gnostic system of thought,

¹⁵⁸ The *Hermetica* (*C.H.*) and related *Aesclepius* likely date from the second to third century AD. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 11. Dodd makes a case for parallels between knowledge in GJohn and in the *Hermetica*. Ibid., 14-17, 151-156. Notably, in both, salvation lies in the "knowledge of God" (John 17.3; *C.H.* 10. 4, 15). All translations taken from *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation, with Notes and Introduction*, Brian P. Copenhaver (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

¹⁵⁹ E.g., *C.H.* 4.4; 10.15; 11.21; 20.31.

¹⁶⁰ Copenhaver suggests that this idea derives from Egyptian sources. Copenhaver, *Hermetica*, 233. Philo expresses a similar idea in his exposition of Exodus 3.14: "Therefore, it followed that no essential name could be given to the one 'who is' truly." Philo, *Mut.* 11. All text of Philo taken from *Philo*, 10 vols., trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. LCL (London: William Heinemann, 1929-1962). Translations are my own.

¹⁶¹ This treatise may have been composed by Valentinus himself, and date from the second century. See "The Gospel of Truth," trans. Harold Attridge and George MacRae, in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 3rd ed., ed. James Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 38. Translations from *ibid.*, 40-51.

the name concept in the *Gospel of Truth* means essence or being. So, the idea of being given a name means to be called into being (e.g., Gos. Truth 27.26-33). It denotes human beings in their existence. Similarly, the “Father’s” Name is his very being, which is hidden. This accounts for the invisibility of this Name (38.16-19). And since he exists in himself, he alone can give himself a name (38.11-15, 26-27). Thus, in revealing his Name through and giving it to the “Son,” the Father shares with the Son his very being: “the name of the Father is the Son.”¹⁶² By embodying the divine Name, the Son reveals the divine origin of all those who are named (i.e., called into being) by the Father, and makes self-knowledge, i.e., salvation, possible:

In diesem Namen, dem Urbild und gemeinsamen Nenner aller Namen, erkennen die zu Erlösenden ihren Namen, d.h. ihre Wesenheit und kommen so zu sich selbst, d.h. sie existieren, so wie der Vater existiert, der von sich selber weiß.¹⁶³

Untergassmair concludes that Name-revelation in the *Gospel of Truth* is mythological language, functioning within the gnostic system to describe the inner human process of self-knowledge. The Name refers, first, to the essence of the otherworldly hidden self, referred to as “Father.” It also denotes the worldly self. And the identification of the Name with the *Logos*, who then reveals the hidden Name (i.e., the divine origin of man) is the means by which the worldly and otherworldly selves may be re-unified.¹⁶⁴

Although the language of Name-revelation in the *Gospel of Truth* bears superficial resemblance to John 17.6, 26, the meaning and significance of the language is entirely different.¹⁶⁵ For John, Name-revelation means the eschatological disclosure of divine character and action in historical events, not an inner journey of self-discovery. And it leads to knowledge of the profound association of Father and Son which gives life, not knowledge of the self, and the “peace” that results from the re-unification of other-worldly and worldly selves. Therefore, Raoul Mortley is correct in his judgment that the concerns of the *Gospel of Truth*—notably the relationship between naming and being, “strikes an *original* note in the history of Christian philosophy.”¹⁶⁶ Certainly the texts share similar language, but it helps little to posit that John 17 is

¹⁶² Gos. Truth 38.6-7; cf. 38.8; 39.19-20, 25-26; 40.5, 24-25

¹⁶³ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 288.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 289-290.

¹⁶⁵ Schnackenburg, III: 176.

¹⁶⁶ Raoul Mortley, “‘The Name of the Father is the Son’ (Gospel of Truth 38),” in *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, ed. Richard T. Wallis and Jay Bregman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 240. Emphasis mine.

influenced by or reacting to gnostic ideas.¹⁶⁷ One could counter that a phrase such as “the Name of the Father *is* the Son” (38.6) itself is a later interpolation, responding to fourth century Trinitarian controversies.¹⁶⁸ What is clear is that, although these texts share similar themes and expressions, there is little resemblance between them in the meaning and significance of the Name.

In summary, the parallels between the motifs of revelation, knowledge, and the Name in various mystical, magical, and gnostic passages and in GJohn are less than may at first appear. Not only does GJohn antedate these texts, but it also reflects a fundamentally different understanding of “knowledge” and “revelation.”¹⁶⁹ More importantly, although the Name in these traditions expresses the mediated knowledge (usually esoteric and mystical) of the divine, or indeed of the self, John’s Name concept means the action and character of God manifest in an eschatologically significant event. And his motive for using the Name category is the eschatological and associative significance of the Name, not its ineffability or the apotropaic qualities that might attend it.

Exodus Tradition

Might John simply have picked up his concept of Name-revelation from Exodus? Earlier in this chapter, it was suggested that the Name character of grace and truth in Exodus 34 is alluded to in John 1.14, and contributes to the meaning of Name-revelation. Related to this, both the Midrashim and one Targum (Tg. Ps-J. Exod 3.14) attempt to explain the doubling of אהיה (“I am/will be who I am/will be”) in Exodus 3.14 in terms of past and future, leading Shirbourn to suggest that the same impetus underlies the doubled aorist and future of Name-revelation in John 17.26.¹⁷⁰ However, this link is far too tenuous as well as methodologically suspect to be of any help here (cf. n. 139).

Meeks argues that it can “scarcely be doubted” that John 17.6 derives from the tradition of Name-revelation in Exodus 3.13-14 and 6.2-3.¹⁷¹ This suggestion should not be dismissed on the

¹⁶⁷ Pace Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 304.

¹⁶⁸ Mortley, “The Name of the Father is the Son,” 241.

¹⁶⁹ See Mary Redington Ely, *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 78-114, 130-151. Similarly Schnackenburg, III: 176 (although oddly, he remains committed to the notion that John was influenced by Gnosticism). By contrast, for the OT background to John’s concept of “knowledge,” see Barrett, 503; Brown, II: 752-753.

¹⁷⁰ Shirbourn, “Giving,” 236, n.109.

¹⁷¹ Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 291.

grounds that John lays no stress on the referent of the Name (i.e., YHWH), since Name-revelation in Exodus is primarily about the disclosure, not of consonants, but of divine action and character.¹⁷² Indeed, John's Name-revelation concept is firmly rooted in a tradition derived ultimately from Exodus 3 and 34.

However, the text of Exodus itself only gets us so far. Although it has exerted influence on the meaning of the Name and Name-revelation in GJohn, it fails to account for the eschatological significance the Name has for John. Although Exodus grounds an expectation for God to act in the future (e.g., Exod 34.10), the explicit anticipation of future Name-revelation is first reflected in later texts derived from it, such as Isaiah 64.2-3[1-2].¹⁷³

Likewise, Exodus fails to account for how a distinguishable figure could be so identified with divine Name-revelation. For Meeks, Jesus' role as Name-revealer reinforces a parallel between Jesus and Moses, to whom the Name was first revealed.¹⁷⁴ However, Meeks overlooks the glaring difference between these passages: God reveals his Name *to* Moses, but *Jesus* reveals the Name in John 17. Indeed, the text of Exodus could hardly have generated the presentation of Jesus in a role which, in Exodus and throughout Jewish tradition, was the sole prerogative of God. Indeed, the divine Name was a means of divine *self*-disclosure,¹⁷⁵ and the Name-revelation of Exodus the basis for all further divine *self*-revelation.¹⁷⁶ In fact, although various figures bear or are authorized by the divine Name, I am unaware of any Jewish text antedating John 17, in which a figure distinguishable from God claims to have *revealed* the divine Name, or indeed is himself intrinsic or essential to the divine Name that is revealed. Thus, both the eschatological and associative significance of the Name in GJohn must be otherwise accounted for.

¹⁷² As discussed above, *pace* Untergassmair, who dismisses Exodus 6.2 as a possible "Hintergrund" of John 17.6 because he incorrectly assumes the focus of Exodus is on the revelation of a proper Name, YHWH. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 213.

¹⁷³ By locating Name-revelation chronologically, and tying it to divine salvific action in history, the Exodus narrative established a precedent for descriptions of future divine deliverance: "I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as their God, but my name, Lord, I did not disclose to them" (Exod 6.3). Isaiah seems to have recognized the centrality of the divine Name to the Exodus narrative, and derived his own Name concept from there. For instance, in Isaiah 63.8-14, the author reflects on the Exodus, concluding that God rescued Israel "to make for himself an everlasting name" (Isa 63.12). He petitions God to deliver again, appealing to the fact that "from the beginning, your Name is upon us" (Isa 63.16; cf. v19). He then goes on to imagine the scene of a new deliverance, in which God's "glorious deeds" would result in the manifestation of the divine Name (Isa 64.2-3[1-2]).

¹⁷⁴ Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 291.

¹⁷⁵ Giesbrecht, *Gottesnamens*, 41-44.

¹⁷⁶ Grether, *Name und Wort*, 15. Also von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1, 185.

Although John's divine Name concept is reminiscent at the level of meaning and function to some of the background traditions discussed above,¹⁷⁷ it is here proposed that John's engagement with the text of Isaiah in particular highlighted for him the eschatological significance of the divine Name and provided him with a means of appropriating the category through the associative significance of the Name. Of course the anticipation of the future revelation or glorification of Name is not unique to Isaiah: Elsewhere, devotees petition God to manifest his Name,¹⁷⁸ and notably in Ezekiel 39.7-8, God promises to make his Name known.¹⁷⁹ However, it is only in Isaiah—hints in the HB itself, made more explicit in the LXX and in later interpreters—that the eschatological and associative significance of the divine Name converge, and John's explicit indebtedness to Isaiah stands in contrast to the muted influence of Ezekiel.¹⁸⁰ Although the Name language in Isaiah may well be derived from the Exodus tradition, in "eschatologizing" it, Isaiah furnished John with a means of locating Jesus at the heart and climax of Jewish expectation.¹⁸¹ Furthermore, in both Isaiah and GJohn, the Name is associative in

¹⁷⁷ E.g., the identification of Name-hallowing with the cross is implicit in Matthew, the authorizing function of the Name is reminiscent of Name Angel traditions, and the meaning of the Name as the character and action of God is present already in Exodus.

¹⁷⁸ 1 Kgs 8.43; also 2 Chr 6.33; Ps 82[83].19; Also the *Kaddish* prayer: "...Magnified and sanctified be his great name...and may his kingdom come...May his name be blessed forever and ever." Text from Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 24. McNamara contends the core of the prayer including these lines likely predates AD 70. Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 71. Heinemann is more cautious. Heinemann, *Prayer*, 24-25.

¹⁷⁹ See discussion in chapter 1, n.64. See also Ezek 36.23; Jer 16.21; 4Q542 col I 1.1. Tg. Ps. 83.19. In addition, future Name-revelation might be inferred from passages which describe God's Name one day being "glorious" (Isa 24.15) or "forever" (2 Chr 7.16; 33.4, 7), or which promise that people will "fear" his Name (Ps 101[102].16; Isa 59.19) or "hear" it (Isa 66.19), or that the Name will be "one" (Zech 14.9), which b. Pesachim 50a takes to mean a correspondence between the letters (of the Name) written and pronounced.

¹⁸⁰ Speaking of these two passages, Schnackenburg notes "From here there is a broad way to the revelation of the name of God mentioned in John 17.6. All that is missing is the mediation through a bearer of revelation and acceptance by a particular circle of recipients of the revelation." Schnackenburg, III: 175. I propose that Isaiah is not simply broadly related to the language of John 17.6, but the primary impetus behind John's use of the category here.

¹⁸¹ Isaianic "eschatologizing" of Mosaic themes (see n.173) occurs throughout GJohn. In contrast to Moses, through whom God gave manna in the desert, Jesus' coming as the "bread of life" is the realization of Isaiah's promise that they would all be "taught of God" (Isa 54.13). In contrast to Moses, who lifted up the bronze serpent, the Son of Man *must* (δεῖ) be lifted up (John 3.14), arguably because this was prophesied of the Servant (Isa 52.13). Reim, *Studien*, 181-182. What Moses wrote about (John 5.46) is that which Isaiah saw (John 12.41). And in contrast to Moses, through whom the Law came, the Name-character of "grace and truth"—"eschatologized" in Isaiah—comes through Jesus (1.17).

significance. Just as Name-revelation is bound up with the glorification of the Servant in Isaiah 52, so the two are linked in GJohn (17.1, 5-6; cf. 12.23-28). In support of this proposal, general patterns of correspondence will first be observed between the Name concept in Isaiah and GJohn beyond the eschatological and associative significance, followed by discussion of two allusions to Isaiah in GJohn which indicate that Isaiah, in particular, may underlie John's interest in the Name category, as reflected in 12.28 and 17.6, 26.

a) General Correspondence

In chapter 1, it was argued that the Isaianic conceptual set of Name, glory, and "I am" occurs similarly in GJohn. The current chapter substantiates this general point in several ways. First, as discussed in chapter 1, the Name in Isaiah is bound up with both the self-revelation of God and the salvific action of God—particularly as expressed in the Servant. And Isaiah 64.1-3[2-4] reflects the expectation that God would disclose himself, as he had to Moses in Exodus 34. These emphases accord broadly with the *meaning* of the Name in GJohn.

Second, the *function* of the Name in John 12 to legitimate Jesus and his mission is reminiscent of the trials of Deutero-Isaiah, in which divine glory and Name are frequently presented as the primary issue at stake.¹⁸² The Name is featured at the climax of Jesus' hour (12.28; 17.6), and in the testimony of the theophanic voice (12.28; cf. 5.37). Lincoln argues that John intends his readers to recognize that the lawsuit motif, which governs much of the Gospel, is ultimately about the divine Name and reputation.¹⁸³

Third, the summative *function* of the Name in GJohn corresponds to that of the Name in Isaiah 52.6. As discussed in chapter 1, the "I am" sayings in Isaiah are gathered up alongside references to the divine Name in the climactic promise of Isaiah 52.6: "In that day, my people will know my Name." And the vision of eschatological glory (Isa 40.5) is echoed by the promise of Name-revelation (Isa 52.6; 64.2). Similarly, in GJohn, the claims of the community to have beheld Jesus' glory and Jesus' claim to reveal the Name act as bookends encompassing his revelatory mission, which also includes his self-revelatory "I am" sayings. This may come as no surprise, given that John is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for his "glory" concept (John 12.41), and his "I am" sayings, some of which occur in allusions to Isaiah (e.g., John 8.24, 28).

¹⁸² E.g., Isa 42.8; 48.11; 52.6. See also discussion of Name, glory, and "I am" in chapter 1; and Lincoln, *Truth*, 44-49.

¹⁸³ Lincoln, *Truth*, 188.

Within that general frame, additional significance may be found in two observations made earlier: first, that the community confession *ἔθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (1.14) echoes the claim of Isaiah *εἶδον τὸν κύριον* (Isa 6.1), alluded to in John 12.41 (*εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*), and both in turn are echoed by the post-resurrection confession *ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον* (20.18, cf. vv. 25, 28); and, second, that this post-resurrection confession represents a narrative expression of Jesus' promise to reveal the divine Name (17.6). If the confessions correspond explicitly to Isaiah 6.1, and (as argued in chapter 1) implicitly to the promise of Isaiah 40.5 ("the glory of the Lord will be seen"), it is plausible that the revelation of the Name in 17.6 was generated similarly by passages in Isaiah, such as Isaiah 52.6.¹⁸⁴

b) Name-Revelation in Isaiah and John 4.26

In addition to such general patterns of correspondence, there are two other indications that John's interest in Name-revelation and Name-glorification may have been generated by passages in Isaiah. First, it is possible that John identifies Jesus with the eschatological divine Name-revelation referred to in Isaiah in the first of Jesus' "I am" sayings, which appears in his revelatory discourse with the Samaritan woman: *ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι* (4.26). This could be translated simply, "I am the one who is speaking with you," like the similar construction in 8.18: *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ*. However, it is more natural to take the preceding reference to *Μεσσίας* or *χριστός* as the implied predicate of *ἐγώ εἰμι*, with *ὁ μαρτυρῶν* standing in apposition. At one level, then, Jesus is identifying himself as the messiah whom the woman anticipates: "*It is I, the one speaking with you.*" Furthermore, two features push readers to see deeper meaning in the declaration of 4.26. First, the expression *ἐγώ εἰμι* acquires theological meaning through the Gospel, most notably in the dramatic reaction it provokes in 8.58-59 and 18.6. This would encourage readers to return to and re-read chapter 4 with fuller awareness. This is insufficient on its own, since the use of the expression *ἐγώ εἰμι* in 8.18 and 9.9 is unremarkable. However, second, the irony of the discourse with the woman seems to require a double-meaning in the *ἐγώ εἰμι* saying to achieve resolution. The discourse is full of irony, generated by the combination of

¹⁸⁴ The identification of *ὁ κύριος* with Jesus and the confession "I have seen the Lord" are unlikely to have been generated by the claim to Name-revelation, as they are traditional (cf. Phil 2.9-11; 1 Cor 9.1). Yet it does not follow from this that the claim of 17.6 was generated by these traditions—since no such claim is made for Jesus in Paul or elsewhere. *Pace* Roukema, who argues that Jesus reveals the Name (17.6) because John had identified Jesus with *ὁ κύριος* in Isaiah. Roukema, "Jesus and the Divine Name in the Gospel of John," 223.

readers' prior knowledge of Jesus' identity, Jesus' question: "If you knew...who it is that is saying to you....," and the woman's query if Jesus might be greater than Jacob on the other.¹⁸⁵ At the climax of the dialogue, Jesus' affirms ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι (4.26).¹⁸⁶ This claim functions to substantiate how Jesus can supply "living water," and that he is greater than Jacob; consequently, it must mean more than the admission "I am the messiah you anticipate."¹⁸⁷ Here the woman is apprised of what the readers have already been given to know about Jesus, and her ignorance functions as a foil for the characterization of Jesus.¹⁸⁸

Ball argues that the key to the second level of meaning in Jesus' claim, ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι, lies in the recognition of an allusion to Isaiah 52.6: "Therefore my people shall know my name, that I am he who speaks."¹⁸⁹ The HB features the distinctive divine self-expression "I am he" (אני הוא): כי אני הוא המדבר (אני הוא). The LXX translator, who often renders this simply with ἐγώ εἰμι (e.g., 41.4; 43.10; 46.4), has added the object αὐτός here, probably to highlight the underlying HB אֲנִי, and God's speaking role: ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός ὁ λαλῶν.¹⁹⁰ Admittedly, the expression occurring in John 4.26 is not identical to Isaiah 52.6 LXX. It may be that John had the HB in view.¹⁹¹ Alternatively, Ball's attempt to identify an allusion specifically to Isaiah 52.6 may be misguided, and it may be the Isaianic self-expression אֲנִי הוּא in general upon which John draws here, as he does elsewhere in his Gospel.¹⁹² If so, the connection to the Name-revelation of Isaiah 52 in John 4 is more remote. However, as discussed in chapter 1, within Isaiah, this self-expression is related to the divine Name and its manifestation. As Jesus both reveals the Name (17.6) and declares ἐγώ εἰμι, it is likely

¹⁸⁵ Readers know already that Jesus is the "Word" (1.14), the "true light" (1.9-11), the only "Son" (1.14, 18), the messiah (1.41), and the "king of Israel" (1.49). Ball, *I Am*, 60.

¹⁸⁶ Boy Hinrichs, *"Ich Bin": Die Konsistenz des Johannes-Evangeliums in der Konzentration auf das Wort Jesus* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988), 18-22. Ball, *I Am*, 66.

¹⁸⁷ Brown, I: 172. Harner, *I Am*, 47. Ball, *I Am*, 66, 271. This two-tiered significance accords with John's purpose statement, which identifies Jesus as messiah, but also as so much more: "the Christ, the Son of God" (20.31).

¹⁸⁸ Gail R. O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 50. Cf. Brown, I: 177.

¹⁸⁹ See Ball, *I Am*, 60. Similarly, Harner, *I Am*, 45-47.

¹⁹⁰ Williams, *I Am He*, 57. A similar phenomenon occurs elsewhere (e.g., Jer 14.22 LXX), and אֲנִי is often rendered αὐτός in the LXX of Isaiah (e.g., 7.14; 8.13; 10.7; 18.2; 41.7; 45.13, 18; 53.5, 7, 11-12; 63.9-10).

¹⁹¹ Jesus' statement is very similar to 1QIs^a 52.6: כי אני הוא המדבר הנני. It may be that John was familiar with a similar version.

¹⁹² See discussion in Chapter 1.

that John regarded the eschatological revelation of the Name described in Isaiah (e.g., 52.6; 64.2[1]) as occurring in Jesus.

This would account for at least two other elements in the text. First, John chooses this discourse to alert readers to the arrival of Jesus' hour (4.23)—the hour expounded throughout John as the sharp edge of an age characterized by the glorification (12.28) and revelation of the Name (17.1, 6, 26). As Jesus' revelatory expression "I am" resolves the irony of the dialogue, so it substantiates the claim that this age is "now here." Presumably, this is so because the "I am" saying identifies Jesus and his hour with the eschatological divine Name manifestation of Isaiah. If so, his hour would entail the era in which "all the ends of the earth will see the salvation which is from God" (Isa 52.10; also 40.5). The woman, then, becomes one of those whom Isaiah said would know the divine Name "in that day" (Isa 52.6). And the deduction drawn by the Samaritans from the "word" of "the one speaking" (John 4.26) about the universal scope of Jesus' mission is apropos: "...we know that this is truly the Saviour *of the world*" (John 4.42).

Second, Jesus' response, ἐγώ εἰμι, affirms that he is the one whom the woman said will "proclaim (ἀναγγέλλω) all things (ἅπαντα) to us," which in turn has resonance with the predictive ability of YHWH in Isaiah. For John, Jesus is to be associated with the God of Isaiah, whose ability to "declare" (ἀναγγέλλω) things beforehand distinguishes him as sovereign and unique, i.e., the one who declares "I am":¹⁹³ "...Who *will declare* to you the things from the beginning?...You be witnesses to me...that you may know and believe and understand that *I am*; before me there was no other god..." (Isa 43.9-10).¹⁹⁴ Jesus can proclaim future things, and his words elsewhere are equated with Scripture, because they are the words of "the one speaking" in Isaiah.¹⁹⁵

Thus, in John 4.26, Jesus affirms that he is the realization, not only of messianic hope, but of divine eschatological self-manifestation. He is the one who declares, "I am," and who proclaims

¹⁹³ John uses the same verb, ἀναγγέλλω, when Jesus promises that the Paraclete will declare to the disciples all the things he hears from Jesus (16.13-15). And elsewhere, John is intent on his readers knowing Jesus' predictive ability (John 2.19-22; 18.9). It may not be incidental that, of the two elements in the woman's testimony, "He cannot be the messiah can he?" and "he told me everything (πάντα) I have ever done" (4.29), it is the latter which John repeats (4.39).

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Isa 41.26; 42.9; 43.12; 44.7; 45.21; 46.10; 48.3, 5, 14. Young notes that ἀναγγέλλω is "characteristic" of Isaiah, where it appears 57 times. Young, "A Study," 14. Note however, that John's use of this Isaianic motif is likely filtered through the apocalyptic texts of Daniel and 1 Enoch. See Williams, "Unveiling Revelation," 104-127.

¹⁹⁵ See Isaiah 45.19; 52.6; cf. 40.5; 46.11; 48.15; 58.14; 65.12; 66.4. John identifies Jesus' words with Scripture explicitly in 2.22, and implicitly by referring both to Scripture and Jesus' words as being "fulfilled" (compare 17.12 and 18.9).

the future things; and his hour is “that day” of which Isaiah spoke. God’s promise to reveal his own Name is fulfilled in Jesus.¹⁹⁶ It is difficult, then, to imagine that John did not understand Jesus’ later claim—“I have made your name known” (17.6)—in light of the same background. This should come as no surprise, since, as we observed earlier, Jesus’ claim to Name-revelation marks the completion of the “work” (4.34-35) which Jesus achieves symbolically by revealing himself to the woman in the self-declaration, ἐγὼ εἰμι. And indeed, the moment in which this “work” reaches its climax in chapter 12 is also punctuated by a concern for the divine Name (12.23-28).

c) Isaiah 52—53 in John 12

A second indication that John’s interest in the Name was generated by Isaiah may be found in the distinctive features of John’s “Gethsemane” scene (12.27-28). Earlier, it was observed that John adapts the traditions preserved in the Synoptic scenes of Gethsemane, the Lord’s prayer, and possibly the theophanic voice to highlight the divine Name at the climax of Jesus’ eschatological mission—a Name which entails both the Father and Son. It is suggestive then that John has here also drawn upon Isaiah 52—53, a passage in which the divine Name is associative and eschatological.

Generally speaking, Isaiah 52—53 has informed John 12 to some degree. Most explicitly, the exaltation and glorification of the Son (12.23, 32-34), combined with the citation of Isaiah 53.1 (12.38), suggests that John identified Jesus’ glorification with that of the Servant in Isaiah 52.13.¹⁹⁷ In light of this connection, Beutler suggests that the Gentiles who come to “see” the exalted Servant in Isaiah 52.15 generated the significance attributed by John to the Greeks, whose coming signals the arrival of Jesus’ hour of glorification (12.20).¹⁹⁸ In addition, the passages share broad thematic links, including the presence of “all nations/people” (Isa 52.10, 15; John 12.19-20, 32), the context of Jerusalem (Isa 52.9; John 12.12), the eschatological significance of the scene (Isa 52.6; John 12.23, 28),¹⁹⁹ and a focus on the divine Name (Isa 52.6; John 12.28).²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁶ Ball, *I Am*, 180.

¹⁹⁷ Evans, “Obduracy and the Lord’s Servant,” 221-236; Idem., “Voice from Heaven,” 405-408. Bruce Chilton suggests instead that it is the targumic version, with its association of messiah with the idea ὑψωθήναι, which has informed John here, since this association underlies the assumption of the crowd that Jesus is referring to the messiah (John 12.34). Bruce Chilton, “John 12.34 and Targum Isaiah 52.13,” *NovT* 22 (1980): 176-178. Either way, the Isaiah tradition is in view.

¹⁹⁸ Beutler, “Greeks Come to see Jesus,” 333-347.

¹⁹⁹ Evans thinks “the hour” is inspired by Isaiah’s eschatological formulation “in that day....” Evans, “Voice from Heaven,” 408. This should be held loosely. Mihalios has advanced a thoughtful argument that

In this context, it may be that Isaiah was the impetus for the distinctive adaptation of the Synoptic traditions, which converge in John 12.28. The change in verb from Isaiah's "make known" to "glorify" reflects John's alignment of the Name with his glory motif, which itself has its roots in Isaiah.²⁰¹ Evans even suggests that the divine promise in Isaiah 52.6: "Therefore my people shall know my name in that day, because I myself am the one who speaks..." generated 12.28b, where God *speaks* about his own Name.²⁰² Furthermore, God's concern for the universal vindication of his Name (Isa 52.5-6; cf. 42.8; 48.11) accords with the polemical function of the theophanic voice in the context of John's forensic framework. But most importantly, the eschatological and associative significance of the Name in Isaiah 52—53 corresponds to John 12, in which the eschatological hour features the Name, which itself entails the association of both Father and Son. There is every indication that John thought the promise of future Name-revelation in Isaiah (e.g., 52.6; 64.2[1]) was occurring in Jesus.

Conclusion

In conclusion, John has interacted with key passages in Isaiah that feature the divine Name. And although John's concept of Name-revelation is influenced by the wider theme of Name-revelation in the OT tradition, he accesses this tradition through Isaiah precisely because Isaiah combines an eschatological Name concept with a distinguishable figure, thereby supplying John with a category in which to locate the significance of Jesus and his eschatological mission.

the hour is Danielic, i.e., that John has "combined the hour (ὥρα) with eschatological expressions and themes that have their source in Daniel." Stefanos Mihalios, *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature* (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 171. Either way, the eschatological significance of Jesus' hour is not in dispute. *Ibid.*, 124-139.

²⁰⁰ See also discussion in chapter 1.

²⁰¹ See discussion in chapter 1. In addition, revelation and glorification are closely intertwined in GJohn, as indeed they were for the targumist, who renders Isaiah 52.6 as "Therefore my name shall be *exalted* (רָבִי) among the peoples...." And interestingly the trishagion featured in the vision of glory in Isaiah 6, to which John alludes in 12.41, was commonly referred to as the "sanctification of the Name" (e.g., Midr. Deut 2.33).

²⁰² Evans, "Voice from Heaven," 408. Other Servant songs may have helped John draw such links. Interestingly, the *Mekilta* frames Isaiah 49.3 with a heavenly voice: "And the holy Spirit *calls aloud from heaven and says*: 'Israel in whom I will be glorified.'" Lauterbach, *Mekilta*, vol. 2, 24. Emphasis mine. Less likely is Dodd's suggestion that the theophanic speech derives from Isaiah 42, like the Synoptic baptismal voice. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 95-96. But if so, the association of Servant and Name in Isaiah 42.1-8 (see discussion in chapter 1) may have generated the ambiguity between the Son and the Name in John 12.23, 28.

John locates the divine Name at the climax of his narrative because he is convinced that the Name is an eschatological concept and that it is ultimately at stake in the mission of Jesus. He identifies Jesus with the divine Name character in Exodus 34 (“grace and truth”) because Isaiah had generated an expectation for Name-revelation in the future. Thus, by summarizing the completion of Jesus’ eschatological mission in terms of Name-revelation (both completed and ongoing), John identifies Jesus with the ultimate climactic action of God revealing his character.

Furthermore, John identifies divine Name-revelation with seeing *Jesus* glory, and identifies the divine Name with the glorification of both the Son and the Father because the Name was for him a concept by which YHWH and the Servant could be associated. As John may well have identified the revelation of the Name in Isaiah 52.6 with beholding the glorification of the Servant in Isaiah 52.13, so Jesus’ glory is identified with the revelation of the Name in GJohn.

Chapter 3: Kept in the Shared Name

Introduction

In the preceding chapters, it was argued that John is indebted primarily to Isaiah for his interest in the divine Name category, and this is reflected in the associative and eschatological significance of the divine Name in the climax and summary of Jesus' mission in 12.28 and 17.6, 26. The present chapter will focus on the petition in 17.11: "Keep them in your Name, which you gave me," and the echoing claim in verse 12: "I kept them in your Name, which you gave me."¹ As in the previous chapter, the aim here is to identify the meaning, function, and significance of the Name in these expressions, as a basis for an inquiry into the possible impetus(es) which may underlie John's interest in the divine Name as it occurs here. To do so, it will be important to consider these statements in isolation, as well as in relation to one another—both the petition (v11) and the claim (v12), as well as the two elements within these parallel statements: "Keep them in your name" and "your name, which you gave me." Although the influence of various aspects of prior Jewish and Christian traditions is probable at the level of meaning and function, John's concepts of Name-keeping and Name-giving grew organically out of the conviction that eschatological Name-revelation occurred in Jesus—a conviction crystallized by John's engagement in particular with certain passages in Isaiah.

¹ There are several textual variants for 17.11-12, but most significantly regarding the relative clause which follows "your name" in both verses 11 and 12 (P66* has "my name" in both vv.11-12, whereas P66^c has "your name," like most other mss). In verse 11, the best attested variant contains the relative pronoun ϕ (P66 P66 \aleph A B C K L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f^{13}), which identifies the "name," not believers ($\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ in D¹ 892^s or σ in D* 1424), as that which was given to the Son. A copyist may have introduced $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$, either under the influence of verse 9, or in an attempt to deal with the theological difficulty of Name-giving. The suggestion that ϕ is a mistranslation of the Aramaic $\bar{\eta}$ (= $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$) seems unlikely. A similar range of variants is available for verse 12, where the relative ϕ is less well attested (\aleph^2 B C* L W 33). Still, the relative $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ enjoys slightly weaker support (A C³ D Θ Ψ f^{13}). The omission of the entire clause from two witnesses (\aleph^* and P66*) may have been for simplicity. Such repetition is characteristically Johannine (e.g., 17.6, 26). Therefore, the most probable reading for both verses 11-12 is $\tau\omega\ \delta\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \phi\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\iota$. So Barrett, 507-508; Brown, II: 759; Schnackenburg, III: 181; Carson, 562. Shirbourn provides the most thorough defense of this reading. Shirbourn, "Giving," 9-49.

17.11-12: Name-Giving

Meaning

Granted that the implied referent of the Name given to Jesus is the sacred covenant Name, YHWH, the question remains of what this means or connotes.² Various suggestions have been made. Kerr, for instance, thinks the Name means divine glory, which is similarly shared with Jesus in 17.22.³ However, despite the conceptual overlap between Name and glory in John 17, divine glory is extended to believers (17.22), whereas the Name is given only to Jesus.

Shirbroun proposes that the meaning of the Name-giving is governed by 17.2, where Jesus is granted authority to give *life*, and accords with the “oneness” theme, which he takes to mean the sharing of *life* between Father and Son.⁴ Thus he takes the Name to mean divine life.⁵ In this, he echoes McPolin, who suggested the Name-giving means the “unique and transcendent communion of life shared by Father and Son.”⁶ However, if 17.2 is to be taken into account, the Name is more naturally aligned with the *authority* which is given the Son, that he may give life and judgment (cf. 5.27-29) to others. The authority to give life (17.2) recalls 6.27, in which Jesus is able to give eternal life, because (γάρ) the Father has “sealed” (ἐσφράγισεν) him. Although sealing could refer to the Spirit’s descent (1.32), the implicit referent of sealing language in the ancient world was a name.⁷ Thus, the sealing is clarified by the Name-giving of 17.11. In John 6, Jesus is sealed so he may “raise up” his followers on the last day, and not “lose any” (μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ) (6.39; cf. 6.12), except Judas (6.64, 70). Similarly, in 17.12, he did not lose any (οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο), except one, but kept them in the Name he was given. Thus, the Name-giving has more to do with authority than with divine life.

² Shirbroun introduces a false dichotomy when he suggests that the Name-giving is not the giving of a particular name (such as יהוה/κύριος), but simply the communication of divine life. This represents an unwarranted conflation of denotative and connotative levels of meaning. Shirbroun, “Giving,” 287.

³ Kerr, *Temple*, 364-365.

⁴ Shirbroun, “Giving,” 271.

⁵ Ibid., 164; cf. pp. 267-268.

⁶ McPolin, “The Name,” 99.

⁷ See discussion later in this chapter. Gieschen also suggests a link in passing between this sealing and the divine Name. Gieschen, “Divine Name,” 135-136. Although “sealing” language is tied elsewhere to the Spirit (e.g., 2 Cor 1.22; Eph 1.13; 4.30), the Spirit’s descent in John 1.32-33 does not function to confer authority on Jesus so much as identify him to the Baptizer.

Untergassmair is perhaps closer when he suggests that the Name-giving means that the Father gives the Son his own revelatory role, of which Name-revelation is symbolic.⁸ The Name given in 17.11 is the Name revealed in 17.6, which is bound up with Jesus' revelatory mission. However, as argued in chapter 2, the Name in 17.6 does not mean simply "revelation" itself, but is bound up more specifically with the self-revelation of God in salvific action, and in the divine character of grace and truth (1.14).

So, it may be proposed that the Name-giving means the extension to Jesus of divine character ("grace and truth")⁹ and divine prerogatives (judgment, life-giving, etc.), which are exercised in his earthly mission. This accounts for how glory from the Father, full of grace and truth, may be seen in Jesus; and it grounds a mission characterized by divine action which could then be summarized in terms of divine Name-revelation (17.6). It is a mistake to confuse the goal of this mission—the communication of life to believers (v2)—with the authorization for that mission. The Name-giving means that the Father has extended to the Son his own active role in the world. And the Name itself means the action and character of the Father.

Function

Within the Name-giving expression, the divine Name functions primarily to authorize Jesus for his life-giving mission, and for embodying divine action and character. This may be seen in three ways. First, as noted earlier, there is a likely relationship between the authority given Jesus to give life (17.2), and the Name given Jesus so that believers kept in that Name may be "one." Second, if the "sealing" of 6.27 implies Name-giving, it is significant that the function of the sealing is "authorization" or "credentialing."¹⁰ Third, the authorizing function of the Name emerges when 17.11 is located in the broader context of John's theme of "giving" (δίδωμι). Jesus' claim to have been given the divine Name invites readers to recall the Johannine theme of divine

⁸ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 92-93.

⁹ So Carson, 562.

¹⁰ Francis J. Moloney, "The Function of Prolepsis in the Interpretation of John 6," in *Critical Readings of John 6*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 137. John's only other use of the term σφραγίζω is forensic: Believers "certify/testify" that God is true (3.33). It is possible that, similarly, the Father's "testimony" to the Son (5.37) corresponds to his "sealing" him. So Westcott, 100; Barrett, 287; Schnackenburg II: 38. Lincoln, 226-227. But, as the subject and use of the term differs, Bultmann is correct to recognize that 6.27 cannot be elucidated simply based on 3.33. Bultmann, 225, n.1. It may well function in both senses—to testify *and* authorize. Reynolds, *Son of Man*, 151; Peder Borgen, "John 6: Tradition, Interpretation and Composition," in *Critical Readings of John 6*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 100.

giving which pervades the Gospel, and is particularly pronounced within John 17 itself.¹¹ In his study of the Name-giving, Shirbroun argues that John uses “giving” language to establish both the authority of Jesus as messiah and revealer, and his dependence on the Father. It both authorizes and legitimates Jesus. He suggests further that the Name-giving constitutes the “climax” or “epitome” of the Father’s giving to the Son, as indeed John’s name theology constitutes an “epitome of the relationship between the Father and Son.”¹² Thus, on the one hand, the Name-giving functions to authorize Jesus for mission. Jesus is sealed in order to raise up followers (6.27, 39), and given authority in order to give life (17.2). It follows that Jesus, similarly, is given the Name in order to “keep” believers in it (17.11).

On the other hand, there are hints that, for John, the Name-giving functions to legitimate several lofty claims made for Jesus throughout the Gospel. First, as the Name-giving authorizes Jesus for his revelatory and salvific mission, so it implicitly grounds and legitimates Jesus’ unprecedented claim to have revealed the divine Name (17.6), i.e., divine Name character (1.14), as well as his claim to have kept believers in that revealed Name (17.12).¹³

In addition, since the Name-giving authorizes Jesus’ mission of life-giving, it implicitly legitimates his claim to “have life in himself” (5.26; cf. 5.40). It follows that, because Jesus is given the Name, he is given to raise others, and perhaps also himself, to life. Indeed, he will rebuild the “Temple” (i.e., raise himself; cf. 10.18), because, as one endowed with the Name, he embodies everything the Temple is (2.19-22).¹⁴ Furthermore, as Jesus’ having life “in himself” recalls the *Logos* in creation (1.3-4), the Name-giving may be regarded as a primordial act, or eternal status of divine conferral, like Jesus’ share in divine glory “before the world existed” (17.5).¹⁵ It is possible

¹¹ Of twelve relative clauses in John 17, ten clarify the object in question as *given* (διδωμι) by the Father: Authority (17.2), work (17.4), followers (17.6, 9, 24), words (17.8), glory (17.22, 24), and the divine Name (17.11-12).

¹² Shirbroun, “Giving,” 286.

¹³ See Shirbroun, “Giving,” 272.

¹⁴ Kerr suggests that God gives the Name to Jesus “in much the same way” as he gives his name to the place of worship. Kerr, *Temple*, 333.

¹⁵ Shirbroun helpfully lists the options for the timing of the giving as (1) in the beginning, (2) at/in the incarnation, (3) during Jesus’ life (e.g., baptism?), (4) at the resurrection, and (5) at/in Jesus’ exaltation. He rightly finds no grounds within GJohn for options 3-5. And although the incarnation (#2) is possible, the parallel between Name and glory, which itself is pre-existent (17.5, 22) leaves the first option as most likely. Shirbroun, “Giving,” 275-276.

that for John, the Name-giving grounds the claim that Jesus is the *Logos*.¹⁶ or Jesus' share in divine glory itself, since the Name-giving enables Jesus to manifest the Name-character of Exodus 34, whereby the disciples see his "glory" (1.14).¹⁷

The Name-giving also grounds Jesus' claim to be "one" with the Father. If believers are "one" like Father and Son, because they are kept in the Name shared between Father and Son, it follows that the oneness of Father and Son is the consequence of the Name-giving (17.11). This link is hinted at in John 10, where Jesus' claim to do works "in my Father's name" is followed by his claim to being "one" with the Father (10.25, 30). And the similarity in the crowd's response to Jesus' claims "I am" (8.58-59) and "The Father and I are one" (10.30) suggests that oneness and the claim "I am" (which itself is somehow connected to the divine Name¹⁸) are related. If so, then the Name-giving undergirds their oneness, and absolves Jesus of the blasphemy charge.¹⁹ The Name-giving may, similarly, legitimate the exclusive claim connoted by the expression "I am."²⁰

Furthermore, the Name-giving legitimates the strong emphasis on Jesus' own name which pervades GJohn: Followers "believe" in (3.18) and pray in his name (14.14), suffer for his name (15.21), and have "life" in his name (20.31), and the Paraclete is sent in his name (14.26). This emphasis on Jesus' name is striking, given the significance of the divine Name for John. However, as there are several respects in which the two names are implicitly paralleled in GJohn, that very emphasis may be justified by the Name-giving.²¹

First, as with the divine Name, Jesus' name is associative. As McPolin has shown, belief in *Jesus'* name (1.12; 2.23; 3.18) is not merely belief in Jesus, but belief in the Son who is sent (6.29)

¹⁶ Untergassmair is too confident of this. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 208. It is difficult to know which convictions may have preceded or generated others for John. Nevertheless, this remains a possibility.

¹⁷ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 386.

¹⁸ The discussion of this at the end of chapter 1 may now be supplemented by the following observations: First, the harvest "work" (4.34-35) achieved symbolically by Jesus' self-revealing expression "I am" (4.26) is bound up with the hour of divine Name glorification (12.23-28) and the Name-revelation in which the "work" is completed (17.6). Second, Jesus' mission to keep believers in the Name (presumably by revealing it to them) (17.6, 11-12) is enacted by his self-revelation "I am" which effects the preservation of his disciples in 18.6-9.

¹⁹ For early Christians, both names and numbers had symbolic value, and both reflected theological conviction in the case of the Father/Son relationship. See François Bovon, "Names and Numbers in Early Christianity," *NTS* 47 (2001): 267-288. Thus, it is unsurprising that a shared Name would be so closely tied to being "one."

²⁰ This is not to say that the Name given is "I am." Pace Brown, II: 756. In GJohn, "I am" does not function as a name *per se*, but parallel with the "I am he" expression in Isaiah.

²¹ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 389.

and the Father who sends him (5.24, 38).²² This is why the fidelity of believers is described alternately as being “kept in *your* name” (17.11-12) and as believing in *Jesus’* name (1.12; 2.23; 3.18). As Brown puts it, believing in Jesus’ name means believing that he bears the divine Name given to him.²³ Both Jesus’ name and the divine Name signal the Father-Son relationship.

Similarly, both the divine Name and Jesus’ name function in paralleled agency expressions. Jesus and the Spirit are both “sent” by the Father (cf. 6.57; 14.26), and the Spirit is introduced as “another Paraclete,” (14.16) implying that Jesus was the first. It is striking, then, that, whereas Jesus comes “in my Father’s name” (5.43), the Paraclete is sent in *Jesus’* name (14.26). Although the expressions employ different verbs, they function similarly to present the figure as the authorized embodied presence of the one in whose name he comes.²⁴ Thus, although believers have life in *Jesus’* name, it is the Spirit who “gives life” (6.67), and who indwells believers (14.17). The overlap in the function of the names of the Father and Son is justified, in part, because they share the divine Name.

Moreover, the functions of the divine Name in the OT are exercised variously in GJohn by the divine Name or by Jesus’ name. As in the OT, the divine Name in GJohn functions as the object of cultic exaltation (12.28),²⁵ as the object of revelation (17.6, 26),²⁶ and to identify believers (17.11-12).²⁷ However, whereas the divine Name functioned as the locus or object of faith in the

²² McPolin, “The Name,” 49.

²³ Brown, I: 11; cf. Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 206.

²⁴ Merlier had argued the various name expressions in GJohn are best understood in relation to the verbs used. Merlier, “Onoma,” 180-204. This approach is helpful for detailed analysis, but in this case, it fails to account for the fact that “coming” and “sending” language mutually interpret one another through the Gospel. Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 241-251. However, “I have come” sayings differ from “sending” statements in that they emphasize the envoy over the Sender. Jan A. Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium: Die Kultur und religionsgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der johanneischen Sendungschristologie sowie ihre traditionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977), 147-152.

²⁵ The divine Name is routinely the object of glorification in Jewish literature. See, e.g., Ps 28[29].2; Isa 24.15; 42.10; 66.5; Mal 1.11; Dan 3.26; Pss. Sol. 10.7; 1 En. 61.9. And, since the divine Name was also “declared,” “loved,” “confessed,” “remembered,” “sought,” “blessed,” and invoked, and could be “blasphemed,” Parkinson concludes that it “...was in many respects the centerpiece of cultic ritual.” Parkinson, “In the Name of Jesus,” 120. Also Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 155.

²⁶ See discussion of the Exodus and Isaianic backgrounds for Name revelation in chapter 2.

²⁷ In the OT, God’s people “know” his Name (e.g., Isa 52.6), are called by or bear his Name (e.g., Num 6.24; Isa 43.7), “hope/trust in” his Name (e.g., Ps 32[33].21; Isa 50.10), confess his Name (e.g., 1 Kgs 8.33), “walk in” his Name (e.g., Mic 4.5), and covenant fidelity is described as “fearing” his Name (Deut 28.58). In all these respects, the divine Name functions to identify the people of God.

OT,²⁸ for John, it is *Jesus'* name in which one must believe (1.12, 2.23, 3.18). Similarly, as noted in chapter 2, the petitionary function of the divine Name is bifurcated in GJohn between the divine Name (revealed) and Jesus' name (invoked). It is not that Jesus' name *is* the divine Name—John never conflates the two.²⁹ Rather God has installed Jesus' name alongside his own.³⁰ Jesus' name acquires its significance because Jesus has been given the divine Name. Indeed, the efficacy of Jesus' name in prayer, in a context featuring divine Name revelation, virtually requires the legitimation granted by the Name-giving. John upholds both names simultaneously, like two notes of a chord, which resonate with each other, and yet remain distinct.³¹ The names, as the figures they represent, evoke each other, and yet acquire their significance from the traditional divine Name concept.

In summary, within the Name-giving expression, the divine Name *means* divine prerogatives and character expressed in action. And it *functions* to authorize Jesus for the mission of keeping believers in the Name, and to legitimate several exalted claims made for him. It also legitimates the cultic use of Jesus' name as reflected in parallel functions, and in the division in OT divine Name functions between them. Since the Name-giving undergirds such objects of Johannine faith as Jesus' claim "I am," and such expressions of Johannine faith as believing in Jesus' name, it also functions as the implicit object of Johannine faith. There is a sense in which Johannine faith consists of believing the Father has given his Name to the Son.

17.11-12: Kept in the Name

Meaning

In 17.11, Jesus petitions the Father, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου (17.11). The petition to "keep" believers should be understood in the context of two major aspects of the context of John 17. First, Jesus' petition "keep them" (17.11) is first in a sequence of petitions that Jesus makes to the Father

²⁸ Ps 32[33].21; Isa 50.10; cf. 1 En. 43.4; 46.8; 67.8.

²⁹ Pace Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 272; Grether, *Name und Wort*, 183. Similarly, Untergassmair may conflate the two names too closely when he suggests, "Im ὄνομα des Sohnes wird daher das ὄνομα des Vaters transparent." Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 181.

³⁰ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 215. Similarly, Parkinson, "In the Name of Jesus," 269.

³¹ The P66* variant reading "my name" in both vv. 11-12 may have been generated by the implicit association of the two names throughout GJohn.

followed by petitions that he protect (τηρήσης) them from evil (17.15), and sanctify (ἁγιάσων) them in the truth (17.17). In this context, the “keeping” action could be somehow related to the consecration of believers.³² More plausibly, “keeping” believers could mean their protection *from* evil. Jesus’ own retrospective claim, ἐτήρουν, is juxtaposed with the admission that Judas is lost (17.12; cf. “snatched” in 10.28-29), which implies that Jesus’ keeping action has to do with protection or salvation.³³ And Schnackenburg suggests that φυλάσσω in verse 12 “narrows down the idea of keeping to ‘guarding’ or ‘protecting’.”³⁴ This could indicate that some protective or apotropaic power resides in the Name itself.³⁵ However, the prepositional phrase governed by ἐν should probably be regarded as locative, not instrumental,³⁶ and thus identifies the Name, not as a protecting power *from* evil, but as a sphere *within* which believers are to remain, perhaps in contrast with “the world.”³⁷ In John 17.11, believers who are ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, are more fundamentally to be ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου.

The second contextual consideration is verse 6, where τηρέω connotes observance or obedience. In response to Jesus revealing the Name and giving the Father’s word (17.6, 8), his followers kept (τηρέω) that word (17.6), and were kept (τηρέω) in the Name (17.12). By implication, Jesus “kept” believers in the Name by revealing that Name to them (17.6);³⁸ and similarly his future

³² Zimmermann suggests that, as πατήρ ἁγίος (17.11a), God is characterized as one who sanctifies disciples. Zimmermann, *Die Namen des Vaters*, 120. Also Westcott, 243; Keener, II: 1057; Schnackenburg, III: 185. Shirbourn, “Giving,” 254-5.

³³ Morris, 727. Note similar ideas in 1 John 5.18 and Revelation 3.10.

³⁴ Schnackenburg, III: 187.

³⁵ As in Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 132-134; Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, 59; Bultmann, 503. In support of this is the fact that protection “by the power of” the Name is not foreign to the OT (see Ps 43[44].6; 53[54].3; 123[124].8); also the Name seal in Revelation 7 is related to the protection of those who remain faithful to Jesus (cf. n.40); and the dramatic reaction to Jesus’ final “I am” saying (18.6-8) may reflect John’s familiarity with Jewish traditions in which the divine Name is apotropaic or numinous. However, on the latter point, John 18 could also be simply a revelatory scene, in which the reaction of falling identifies Jesus with the God who appears in various OT theophanies. It expresses in narrative form a theological idea, such as is reflected in the first “Song of David”: “And the foolish shall not [be able to] stand before Your glory” (v3).

³⁶ Nowhere else in the NT is ἐν instrumental when used with τηρεῖν. And within GJohn, ἐν often identifies a locus or sphere of existence or influence. For instrumental uses, John prefers διὰ. Edwin Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), 236-237, 256. Pace Merlier, who takes ἐν in 17.11 as instrumental. Merlier, “‘Onoma’ et ‘en Onomati,’” 194.

³⁷ In 1 John 5.17-19, the world lies ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ, whilst believers are ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (1 John 5.19), and on this basis are protected by the Son from evil. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 84; Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, 59. Bratcher, “The Name,” 76. Merlier, “Onoma,” 194. Keener, II: 1057-8.

³⁸ Shirbourn, “Giving,” 268.

Name-revelation (17.26b) facilitates the future “keeping” of believers which he petitions of the Father in 17.11. Jesus reveals the Name in order to keep believers in it. Elsewhere in GJohn, abiding in Jesus and obedience to him are closely intertwined (15.10; cf. 14.18-24), and in Revelation 3.10, Jesus will keep (τηρήσω) his followers from the coming trial because they kept (ἐτήρησας) his word. In this context, keeping in the Name means keeping believers faithful or obedient to the revelation.

It is certainly possible that, in the Name-keeping, John had all these nuances—sanctify, protect, and keep faithful—in view.³⁹ However, given the points against the first two options noted above, “keep faithful” is likely to be the primary meaning. Those who are kept in the Name are *simultaneously* sanctified and *consequently* protected.⁴⁰ After all, Jesus’ sheep are kept from the destroying thief as a consequence of knowing his voice and following him (10.8-10).

Within the Name-keeping expression, then, the Name itself is that to which believers are kept faithful. It is the locus of fidelity. As Untergassmair suggests, the petition is essentially “den Zustand der gläubigen Jünger zu bewahren.”⁴¹ Thus the subordinate clause “which you gave me” becomes all-important. Being kept in the divine Name means being preserved in the sphere of fidelity to a Name defined essentially as shared between Father and Son.⁴² As a petition, the expression means that *the Father* sustains and nourishes in believers the conviction that the Son bears and reveals the Father’s own Name; but as a petition for fidelity, it means that *believers* remain faithful to this conviction.⁴³

³⁹ Rouiller suggests the Name is both a “Heimat” and a “Festung.” Rouiller, “Leben in seinem Namen,” 58.

⁴⁰ In Pss. Sol. 16.2-6, fidelity converges with divine protection, where the one who “confesses your name” will not be disturbed by evil “for God’s mark is on the righteous.” Similarly, in Revelation, it is arguably because the Name identifies individuals as belonging to God that they are protected from the judgments of divine agents, and not because of the Name itself (Rev 3.12; 14.1; 22.4).

⁴¹ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 100. Similarly Beasley-Murray suggests it means “adherence to what Jesus has revealed to the disciples of the character of God.” Beasley-Murray, 299; Also Lindars, 524; Schnackenburg, III: 180; Francis J. Moloney, “To Make God Known: A Reading of John 17.1-26,” *Salesianum* 59 (1997): 477.

⁴² Brown writes that these followers “know [Jesus’] divine name and are committed to all that it implies...” Brown, II: 756. Similarly, Lindars, 524; Barrett, 507; Schnackenburg, III: 180; Hoskyns, II: 593.

⁴³ This dual-emphasis is at home in a Gospel in which the one who “comes” to the Father is “drawn” by the Father (6.37, 44, 65). Cf. Ode 8.10: “Keep my mystery, you who are kept by it; keep my faith, you who are kept by it.” All translations of the *Odes* taken from *The Odes of Solomon*, trans. James H. Charlesworth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

This meaning accords well with several features of GJohn. It makes better sense of the fact that the result of being “kept” is being “one,” since threats to unity likely came from conflicting beliefs within the community (17.11).⁴⁴ Believers are united with the Father and Son and with one another⁴⁵ precisely because they adhere to the oneness of God, which is expressed in the fact that Father and Son share a single name.

In addition, two key expressions of fidelity (i.e., confessions) in GJohn are implicitly connected to 17.11.⁴⁶ First, keeping believers in the Name is connected to the gathering of bread scraps in chapter 6 by the common reference to none being lost, except one (6.12, 39; 17.12). Within John 6, the twelve disciples are likely representative of all believers gathered (as twelve baskets were gathered in 6.13). Consequently, Peter’s confession may represent the kind of fidelity which characterizes those kept in the Name: “You have the words of eternal life, and we have come to believe and know that you are the Holy One of God” (6.68-69; cf. 17.6-8). Second, the resurrection context of the climactic expression of fidelity in the Gospel—“my Lord (ὁ κύριός μου) and my God” (20.28)—may suggest that Jesus here reveals himself as ὁ κύριός.⁴⁷ Moreover, just as Jesus reveals the Name in order to keep believers in it, so his self-revelation as ὁ κύριός in the resurrection elicits confessions⁴⁸ which identify him as ὁ κύριός.⁴⁹ This accords with two other features of the narrative. Since Thomas’ confession occurs in a post-resurrection era of revelation marked by a new relational possibility in which believers call God, “Father” (20.17), it may be an expression of believers’ identity as those who have been granted authority to become “children of

⁴⁴ Some key witnesses omit the phrase ἵνα ὧσιν ἐν καθῶς ἡμεῖς (P66*, it ac²), and it is possible that the phrase is a scribal harmonization with 17.21-23. However, the manuscript evidence is too meager to overturn the text of the NA²⁸.

⁴⁵ Brown, II: 774-779.

⁴⁶ Schnackenburg lists the following references as containing Johannine confessions placed on the lips of characters: John 1.49; 4.42; 6.69; 9.37-38; 11.27; 16.30; 20.16, 28. Schnackenburg, III: 333. I suspect he means 20.18, not 20.16, as he identifies the former in the context as a confession.

⁴⁷ See fuller discussion in chapter 2.

⁴⁸ Lee points out that both Mary and Thomas are “partners in communicating faith,” and Mary is a “representative of the community of faith.” Lee, “Partnership,” 46.

⁴⁹ Bonney has argued persuasively that the recognition of and belief in Jesus in the resurrection appearances is contingent upon Jesus’ initiation, i.e., his self-revelation. Neither Mary nor the disciples are able themselves to recognize Jesus, because he is both object and enabler of faith. William Bonney, *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story at the Climax of John’s Christological Narrative* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 131-173.

God” (1.12) and are kept in his Name (17.11).⁵⁰ And Jesus’ special appearance to Thomas could be regarded as an expression of his commitment not to lose any, but to “keep them” in the Name (17.12). If the link between these confessions and the Name-keeping is justified, so also is the proposal that the Name-keeping means fidelity to the Name. Moreover, it is clear that the subordinate clause “which you gave me” is constitutive of the Name to which believers remain faithful.

Furthermore, the language of being *kept in* the Name is reminiscent of John’s language of “abiding.”⁵¹ For John, “abiding” is characteristic language of fidelity. Abiding in Jesus means obedience to him,⁵² believing in Jesus’ name,⁵³ and petitioning the Father in his name,⁵⁴ which itself likely means the prayer of the *faithful* disciple.⁵⁵ The overlap between abiding and keeping as language of fidelity suggests that being kept in the Name means fidelity to the Name.

In summary, the primary *meaning* of the petition “Keep them in your name” is fidelity to the divine Name, which the Father gives to the Son. Those kept in the Name are those who believe Jesus has been given the Name, and consequently revealed it. Within this expression, the Name itself is the locus, or “Bezugspunkt” of faith.⁵⁶ The Name is the sphere of fidelity—fidelity on the one hand to the Father, in whose Name they are kept, and on the other hand to the Son, to

⁵⁰ Thomas’ confession is the high-point of John’s Christology—perhaps even representative of the special witnessing role of the disciples that is augmented by the Spirit (15.26-27). Bonney, *Caused to Believe*, 144.

⁵¹ Both Jesus’ comments on “abiding” (15.1-10) and on being kept in the Name (17.11-12) are spoken for the joy of his followers (15.11; 17.13). Reading these passages in light of each other may have led the scribe of P75 to substitute τηρέω for αγαπάω in 15.21: “The *one who loves me* will be *kept* by my Father” (although dittography is also possible, since τηρέω occurs in the previous sentence). And allusions to both passages may be combined in Ode 8.20-21: “...abide in the love of the Lord [cf. John 15.9-10]; and you who are loved in the Beloved; and you who are kept in him who lives [cf. John 17.11]....”

⁵² Jesus’ words “abide” in believers (15.7) and are “kept” by them (17.6).

⁵³ “Abiding in” and “believing in” are linked implicitly in 12.46 by a contrast: “...all who believe in me may not remain in darkness.”

⁵⁴ Lincoln, “God’s Name, Jesus’ name,” 174. Abiding in Jesus (15.7) and petitioning the Father in Jesus’ name (15.16) are given as parallel (even synonymous) conditions for effective prayer.

⁵⁵ Untergassmair helpfully lists various scholarly proposals on the meaning of “praying in Jesus’ name”: (1) with reference to Jesus; (2) out of belief in him; (3) according to his will; (4) under or out of the credit of/in Jesus’ name; (5) in inner communion with Jesus; (6) as one who bears Jesus’ name; (7) using this power. Of these, he thinks 1, 4, and 6 have little to commend them. And the other proposals may be incorporated into his suggestion that the prayer in Jesus’ name means “das Bitten der wahren Jünger Jesu,” i.e., the disciple who believes that Jesus is sent from the Father. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 158-159.

⁵⁶ Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 213.

whom this Name has been given.⁵⁷ In other words, the Name means that fidelity to the Father is measured by fidelity to Jesus, and fidelity to Jesus has the status of fidelity to God (cf. 5.23).

Function

The purpose of “keeping” believers in the Name supplied by the text is to produce oneness (“that they may be one”),⁵⁸ and to protect believers (that none would be “lost” 17.12), ultimately so that “the world may believe” (17.21; cf. vv. 18, 23). The retrospective claim (17.12) functions to summarize the success of Jesus’ mission to preserve believers (cf. 6.12; 18.9). The petition (17.11) generated by Jesus’ imminent departure functions as a pastoral exhortation, “that the community of disciples left behind by Jesus should continue in the divine sphere revealed to them by Jesus,”⁵⁹ as they engage in the mission for which they are sanctified.⁶⁰

However, within both petition and claim, the divine Name itself functions to identify believers. Ruck-Schröder rightly calls attention to the function of Jesus’ name as the “Bezugspunkt” of faith, prayer, and suffering.⁶¹ It characterizes the life and identity of the people of God: “Die Existenz der Gemeinde ist durch den Glauben an diesen Namen geprägt (1.12; 2.23; 3.18; vgl. 20.31).”⁶² However, the divine Name is an even stronger candidate for the “Bezugspunkt” of faith in the context of the Gospel. The identity of the true people of God is of major concern to the Fourth Evangelist. He relates heated disputes between Jesus and “the Jews” over who can rightfully claim God as Father (8.41; cf. 5.16-47.; 10.31-39). This is a dispute over the identity of the people of God—between those who claim Abraham’s paternity (8.39) and those who are *true* Israelites (1.47). In addition to claiming God as their father (8.41), the key identity markers for the “Jews” reflected in GJohn are the central Jewish practices including worship in the Temple (4.20),

⁵⁷ This dual-criterion for fidelity is characteristic of GJohn. Honouring the Father entails honouring the Son (5.23). The faithful people of God are characterized on the one hand as “children of God” (1.12), and held in the Father’s hand (10.29), and on the other hand as abiding in *Jesus*, hearing his voice, and believing in his name. Believers are to believe, *both* “in God” and “also in me” (14.1); they are secure in Jesus’ hand *and* in “the Father’s hand” (10.28-29).

⁵⁸ Shirbroun suggests that being kept in the Name *means* oneness. But this confuses meaning with purpose. Shirbroun, “Giving,” 266.

⁵⁹ Schnackenburg, III: 180

⁶⁰ Brown, II: 756. In GJohn, sanctification is *for* mission (10.36; 17.17-19). Note the observation earlier that being “kept” in the Name is simultaneous with sanctification.

⁶¹ Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 213.

⁶² *Ibid.*

Sabbath observance (5.10-17; 7.23), and circumcision (7.22). Fidelity to these covenant practices is indicative of two other key identity markers: being a disciple of Moses (9.28), and a child of Abraham (8.33-53). By contrast, Jesus claims the right to call God his own Father, and thereby identify himself as the *Son*; and he invites his community into the sphere of that identification in 20.17: “I am going up to my Father *and your Father*, my God *and your God*.” Thus it is that members of his community are to be identified as the τέκνα θεοῦ (1.12; 11.52),⁶³ and as *born* “again/from above” (3.5-6). By inviting his followers to think of God as their Father, Jesus encourages them into a relationship with God by which they are identified as the people of God. In this context, the Name in which believers are kept functions as an identity marker of Jesus’ community.

Two observations support this inference. First, throughout GJohn, identity is interwoven with fidelity. Those who “believe” in Jesus’ name are the “children of God” (1.12). Those who recognize his voice and follow him are his sheep, and “of the truth” (10.4; 18.37).⁶⁴ And the true indication of being God’s people is acceptance of his Son (8.42). By contrast, the “Jews” demonstrate their devilish paternity by their rejection of Jesus (8.44; cf. 5.38). It follows then, that since being kept “in your Name” means *fidelity*, it functions to *identify* Jesus’ community. This is expressed alternately in GJohn through name language: Those who believe in Jesus’ name (1.12) or accept him who comes in “my Father’s name” (5.43), i.e., who exhibit Johannine fidelity, are those who have been kept “in your Name, which you gave me” (17.12).

Second, throughout GJohn, identity is intertwined with location. The question of Jesus’ identity—τίς (3.10; 5.12; 8.25, 53)—is bound up with his provenance—πόθεν (2.9; 4.11; 6.5; 7.27-28; 8.14; 9.29-30; 19.9).⁶⁵ Similarly, Jesus’ community is frequently identified by a series of markers prefixed by εἰς or ἐν—Jesus, his name, love and word, and spirit and truth—because the identity of believers is a matter of where they abide (6.56; 8.31; 15.4-7, 9-10), where they place their faith,⁶⁶

⁶³ This phrase functions even more as a title in 1 John 3.1, “that we might be *called* (κληθῶμεν) τέκνα θεοῦ,” thereby linking it more closely with the concept of being called by the divine Name (Isa 43.7; 63.19).

⁶⁴ John D. Turner, “The History of Religions Background of John 10,” in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 41-42.

⁶⁵ To “be from” is synonymous with “coming from” (8.42). See Bultmann, 138, n.1; cf. 135, n.4.

⁶⁶ John 3.15-18, 36; 4.39; 6.29, 35, 40; 7.5, 31, 38; 8.30-31; 10.42; 11.25-26, 45, 48; 12.11, 42, 44, 46; 14.1, 12; 16.9; 17.20; also belief in his name (1.12; 2.11, 23; 3.18), in “the son of man” (9.35-36), or in the “light” (12.36).

or where they worship (4.24).⁶⁷ It is in this context that the Name-keeping must be understood. Through the repetition of the locative ἐν, John sensitizes his readers to apply the identifying function of these other markers similarly to the expression “in your Name” (17.11-12).

Related to this, the Name functions to signal divine ownership of believers. The concept of ownership is already present in the context of John 17: Jesus’ followers were “yours” (i.e., the Father’s) and have been *given* to Jesus (17.2b, 6, 9-10, 24). There is a sense in which he has been entrusted with a possession, which he has successfully “kept” (17.12). Ownership may also be implied by the ἐκ phrases in 17.14, 16: Jesus’ followers do *not* “belong to” (ἐκ)⁶⁸ the world (so NRSV) or the devil (8.44). They are τοὺς ἰδίους (13.1).⁶⁹ This echoes the Shepherd discourse, wherein the distinguishing factor between shepherd and hired hand is ownership (ἰδία in 10.12; τὰ ἐμά in 10.14). It is interesting, then, that a shared ownership of the believers between the Father and Son, corresponds to a shared Name in which believers are “kept.”

In summary, the Name-keeping *means* the preservation of fidelity to the Father in terms of fidelity to Jesus and his earthly revelation. And the Name *functions* to identify believers over-against others as the true people of God.

Significance

We are now in a better position to explore John’s fundamental convictions regarding the divine Name category, i.e., the *significance* of the divine Name, as reflected in 17.11-12.

Associative

The primary significance of the Name here is as an associative concept. Earlier, it was noted that the subordinate clause “which you gave me” crucially qualifies the meaning of the

⁶⁷ This may reflect the influence of one of the primary of these markers: *abiding* or *remaining* (μένω) in. In his ground-breaking study on the covenant motif in Johannine materials, Edward Malatesta pointed out that the preposition ἐν converts these verbs into expressions of the relational and therefore covenantal dynamic which describes Jesus and his followers. Edward Malatesta, *Interiority and Covenant: A Study of Εἶναι Ἐν and Μένειν Ἐν in the First Letter of Saint John* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 24-27.

⁶⁸ Note the parallel text 15.19, wherein the world sees those from (ἐκ) the world as *its own* (ἰδίον). Cf. the use of ἐκ in 3.31; 10.16, 26; 18.37, wherein the connotation of “belonging” similarly seems to overshadow “derivation/origin.”

⁶⁹ Rightly does Bultmann say that the use of ἰδιοί here instead of μαθηταί is significant. Bultmann, 489.

Name which is the object of fidelity. Believers remain faithful to a fundamentally shared Name. Consequently, followers of *Jesus* are identified in terms of the *divine* Name. Similarly, the identity markers, which locate believers in *Jesus* (e.g., believing in his name, abiding in him, etc.), are gathered up by and paralleled with the *divine* Name, in which believers are “kept.” The catchword “name” in both expressions—“believe in [Jesus’] name” and “kept them in your Name”—allows for an implicit association of Father and Son in terms of the Name, which is made explicit in the Name-giving. Being kept in the divine Name *means* fidelity to Jesus, which in turn has become the index of fidelity to the Father (5.23). In other words, the divine Name itself signifies for John the association of Father and Son. Incidentally, this may explain the ease with which John interleaves identifications of ὁ κύριος as either the Father (12.13, 38) or Jesus (1.23; 6.23; 11.2; 20.18, 25, 28).⁷⁰ And it accords with John’s emphasis elsewhere: Followers believe in God *and also* in Jesus (14.1); they are safe in Jesus’ hand, *and* in the Father’s hand (10.28-29); they know the Father *and* the Son (17.3).⁷¹

Even in the Name-giving itself, this associative significance is retained. The Father does not give *away* his Name, and Jesus does not possess the Name independently of God. Likewise the Name-giving does not result in an emphasis on Jesus’ name to the exclusion of the divine Name.⁷² Although we might expect Jesus to exult “I have kept them in *my* name,”⁷³ this climactic claim preserves a duality: The Name is both “*your* Name” and the Name “which you gave *me*.” The primacy of the divine Name category here illuminates the theo-centricity of GJohn, and the Name-giving offers a solution for the challenge to monotheism posed by Jesus’ claims and actions. The associative significance of the Name grants to John this level of nuance.

⁷⁰ Roukema fails to appreciate this in his attempt to drive a clear wedge between ὁ κύριος and the Father in GJohn. Roukema, “Jesus and the Divine Name in the Gospel of John,” 217-218. And Bultmann mistakenly regards the identification of Jesus with ὁ κύριος in 1.23 as “alien to the Evangelist (Bultmann, 91, n.7). On the contrary, this is fully in keeping with John’s Christology, and the Name-giving of 17.11 in particular.

⁷¹ Similarly, in 1 John 4.15, those who “confess that Jesus is the son of God” “abide in God” (cf. 1 John 5.10).

⁷² As, for instance, in Matthew 1.21.

⁷³ Such expectation may indeed explain the variant in the third century manuscript P66: τηρ[ησον] αὐτ[ου]ς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου.

Eschatological

In John 17.11-12, the divine Name also has eschatological significance. The Name-keeping as a whole is eschatological. As noted before, the eschatological mission for which Jesus was sent is two-fold: to reveal the Father (1.18; 17.6) and to preserve those who believe as a result (6.39), or give them eternal life (10.10). This mission is summarized in terms of the divine Name in John 17: The revelatory dimension is gathered up in 17.6: “I have made known your Name,” and the preserving dimension in 17.12: “I have kept them in your Name.” By “keeping” them, Jesus has not lost any (οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο; 17.12), which is the divine will he “came down” to do: “that I should lose nothing [μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ] of all that he has given me” (6.39). Thus the Name-keeping falls within the “work” he accomplished as part of the eschatological mission for which he is sent (17.4).

Likewise, the one exception to his mission, Judas, is also regarded in eschatological terms: “...and not one of them was lost except the one destined to be lost, so that the Scripture might be fulfilled” (17.12). It may be worth noting also that the designation ἀπώλεια used of Judas here usually connotes eschatological damnation elsewhere in the NT.⁷⁴ Although it would be a mistake to derive the eschatological significance of “keeping” believers from the fact that Judas’ exemption from being kept fulfills Scripture, it can serve to reinforce the point. Furthermore, although the phrase “so that the Scripture may be fulfilled” likely applies primarily to the Judas exception, it is possible that, given the significance of the Name-keeping as a summary of Jesus’ eschatological mission, John regarded it also as “fulfilling” Scripture.⁷⁵

More specifically, there are two indications that the Name itself has eschatological significance within the Name-keeping expression. First, the retrospective-prospective dynamic in Jesus’ claim “I have kept them in your Name” and corresponding petition “Keep them in your Name” is reminiscent of a pattern observed earlier:

“I have glorified [my Name] and I will glorify it” (12.28)

“I made your Name known to them and I will make it known” (17.26).

⁷⁴ Especially 2 Thess 2.3, but also Matt 7.13; Acts 8.20; Rom 9.22; Phil 1.28; 1 Tim 6.9; Heb 10.39; 2 Pet 2.1; Rev 17.8, 11.

⁷⁵ I am grateful to David Allen for this suggestion. The ambiguity of the “Scripture” to which Jesus refers in 17.12 has elicited several proposals—most commonly Psalm 40[41].10 (via John 13.18). But among them is von Wahlde’s intriguing suggestion that “fulfillment” may apply primarily to the keeping of disciples, and only implicitly to the loss of Judas, although he links this to Proverbs 24.22a. See Urban von Wahlde “Judas, the Son of Perdition, and the Fulfillment of Scripture in John 17.12,” in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*, ed. John Fotopoulos (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 174-175.

Earlier it was argued that, in both these passages, the divine Name is central to Jesus' eschatological mission, which has both completed and ongoing dimensions. The similar pattern in 17.11-12 (albeit with roles divided between Father and Son) may reflect the fundamental conviction that the Name itself, in which believers are kept, was an eschatological category, appropriate for an eschatological context.

Second, it was suggested earlier that being kept *in* the Name should be understood alongside other locative expressions, including that in 4.23: "But the hour is coming and is now here, when the *true worshipers* will worship the Father in spirit and truth..." (4.23). "True worshipers," identified with the eschatological hour are thereby identified as a new and eschatological community. Insofar as the divine Name similarly identifies Jesus' community, it identifies the new and eschatological community.⁷⁶ The divine Name is given for Jesus' eschatological mission, characterizes the goal of that mission, and identifies Jesus' new eschatological community. Thus, not only is John consciously aligning believers with the historic people of God, he identifies them as the eschatological people who would "bear" or be called by the Name.

Likewise, the Name within the Name-giving expression is eschatological in significance. The grammatical subordination of Name-giving to the Name-keeping expression reflects an implicit theological subordination: Jesus is given the Name *so that* he may accomplish the eschatological mission of revealing it, and thereby preserve believers in it.⁷⁷ In the same way, Jesus' sealing, which implies the Name-giving, grounds (γάρ) his mission of life-giving (6.27).

Furthermore, since Jesus keeps believers in the Name by revealing the Name to them, the Name-giving is also the necessary prerequisite to Jesus' eschatological mission of Name-revelation (17.6), or the basis for his sending.⁷⁸ In coming, Jesus reveals his pre-existent relationship with the Father which in turn becomes the object of faith, as expressed by Peter ("the holy one of God"), by Thomas ("my Lord and my God"), and by John's audience: "that you may believe that Jesus is...the Son of God" (20.31). Therefore, insofar as the Name-giving expresses the association of Father and

⁷⁶ The author of Revelation seems to regard the divine Name as an eschatological identity marker for the people of God: "His name *will be* on their foreheads" (Rev 22.4; cf. 3.12).

⁷⁷ Because the Name-giving is of such christological interest, it has attracted some interest, sometimes at the expense of observing its role in the relative clause. Shirbourn, for instance, focuses solely on the Name-giving. And Ruck-Schröder rightly criticizes Untergassmair for minimizing the significance of the community being kept in the Name. Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 205-213.

⁷⁸ In v.22, Jesus makes the parallel point that the glory he was given he has shared with, or perhaps revealed to, his followers. Perhaps he is given glory *in order to* reveal it (cf. 1.14; 12.23; 17.1).

Son, and the associative significance of the Name, it is the content of the eschatological revelation itself. In revealing the Name, Jesus discloses *that* he is endowed with the Name. And the fidelity of believers to the Name-revelation is fidelity to the redefinition of the divine Name as being that “which you gave me.” Thus, the divine Name itself is featured as the key category in all three claims which summarize Jesus’ entire eschatological mission: “made known your Name,” “kept them in your Name,” and “your Name, which you gave me.”⁷⁹

John regarded the divine Name itself as both associative and eschatological in significance. It is in the combination of these two aspects that John’s distinctive theology of the divine Name emerges. The shared Name is the ground and content of eschatological revelation, and the locus and identity of the eschatological people of God. And therefore, the Name-giving not only qualifies the Name in which believers are kept, it is the condition by which they may be kept. For John, at the heart of eschatological realization is the association of the Father and the Son, as expressed most poignantly in the shared Name.

Impetus

In the preceding discussion, I have argued that, within the Name-giving expression, the Name *means* the divine character and action which the Father extends to the Son, and *functions* to authorize Jesus for mission, and to legitimate both Jesus himself and the strong emphasis on his own name that pervades the Gospel. Within the Name-keeping expression, the Name *means* the object of fidelity—qualified significantly as a Name shared between Father and Son. And it *functions* to identify the disciples of Jesus as the people of God. As such, the use of the divine Name category legitimates allegiance to Jesus, and the use of Jesus’ name in prayer and as the object of faith. Yet, in both expressions, the *significance* of the divine Name is both associative and eschatological.

Now the question may be engaged: What was the *impetus* for the use of the divine Name in this context? As commentators do not generally distinguish meaning, function, and significance, they typically account for the language of 17.11-12 by pointing to language and concepts in other texts and traditions which parallel either the meaning or function of the Name as John uses it here. To be sure, John is likely indebted to a variety of background influences.

⁷⁹ Shirbroun does not go far enough, then, when he suggests that, as the basis for Name-revelation, the Name-giving is primarily soteriological in significance. Shirbroun, “Giving,” 278.

However, influences may be distinguished from the primary impetus, which, it is here proposed, is best discovered by attending to the *significance* of the divine Name as it occurs here. In what follows, I will explore various conceptual parallels to the Name-keeping and Name-giving, distinguishing influences on meaning, function, and significance, in an effort to isolate the impetus for John's Name concept.

Graeco-Roman Adoption

Both the concept of Name-giving and of being identified by a father's name fit well in a Graeco-Roman context. Some scholars have made the case that GJohn, at least in its final form, represents a counter to Roman imperial ideology—particularly in its presentation of Jesus as a divine “son.”⁸⁰ Might the relationship between Father and Son in terms of the Name category be similarly derived from Graeco-Roman adoption practices? In his helpful survey of adoption in Graeco-Roman culture, Michael Peppard observes that adoption was not about nurturing, or the welfare of orphans, but about the preservation of the family name, glory, and wealth. Fatherhood was not about generation, but rule and dependence.⁸¹ Similarly, sonship was primarily about inheritance and the future, not about origin and the past, as evidenced, for instance, by posthumous adoptions.⁸² Thus adopted sons were not second-class.⁸³ Imperial adoption was about the transfer of power,⁸⁴ and the transfer of imperial power was legitimated by adoption, alongside securing the support of the army and the Senate.

⁸⁰ Richey, for instance, argues that Johannine language including ἐξουσία, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, as well as the prologue and the Passion account, are intended to supplant Augustan dynastic rhetoric and concepts. Lance Byron Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007). Peppard makes a similar case focused on John's sonship language. Michael Peppard, *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). Note however that υἱὸς θεοῦ was by no means common or widespread in the east. John's υἱὸς θεοῦ should be distinguished from the far more common υἱοὶ Διὸς or παῖδες. See Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans., John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1976), 30, n.57.

⁸¹ J. Rufus Fears, “Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology,” *ANRW II* 17 (1981): 20. Cited in Peppard, *Son of God*, 61.

⁸² Peppard, *Son of God*, 52-53, 60-61.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 54-55. For emperors, an adherence to natural succession was balanced by a meritocratic ideology, which was supported by the institution of adoption. Both are in tension in Pliny's *Panegyric to Trajan* 94.5. See Peppard, *Son of God*, 84-86.

⁸⁴ Seneca observed: “But to ‘the Father of his Country,’ we have given the name in order that he may know that he has been entrusted with a father's power...” Seneca, *Clem.* 1.14.2 (Basore, LCL).

The affiliation of emperors and their adopted sons was represented not only in coinage and sculpture, but also in changing the son's name. By taking on the name "Caesar" and "Augustus," heirs were identified with the imperial dynasty.⁸⁵ So Suetonius observes that the adopted son of Galba is thereby made "heir to his property *and name*."⁸⁶ And speaking of Trajan, Pliny summarizes his ideal of the transfer of power to an adopted son in the phrase "simul filius, simul Caesar."⁸⁷ Trajan was destined to be Caesar such that he already bore the name; but he remained subordinate as a "son" of the existing Caesar, Nerva, while Nerva yet lived.

Assuming for sake of discussion that the Fourth Evangelist intended sonship language to counter the imperial ideology of the *divi filius*, it may be tempting to think that his interest in the Name-giving was similarly generated by Roman adoption, and particularly by its role in Roman imperial ideology. Pliny's phrase, "simul filius, simul Caesar," appears to convey something not unlike John's "your Name, which you gave me." And like Roman adoption, the Name-giving in 17.11-12 is tied to and legitimates Jesus' authority. Furthermore, the descent of the dove upon Jesus in 1.32-33—which one could argue enacts the moment of the Name-giving—might well have been read in a Roman context as indicating a rise to power, perhaps even as an adoption scene.⁸⁸ So, might Jesus' claim to be given the divine Name have been intended to mimic or subvert imperial claims to succession through adoption? Although I am unaware of such a direct proposal, Bousset suggested that John borrows the concept of Name-giving from Paul,⁸⁹ who (he suggests) was himself presenting Jesus in terms of the pagan religious environment, in which human beings were regarded as "son of god."⁹⁰

Similarly, one could argue that Jesus' claim and petition to "keep" believers "in your Name" has overtones of adoption. In GJohn, believers are contrasted with the children of the devil as children of God (8.39-47). They are born (γεννάω) of the Father (1.13; 3.1-13) and, in language reminiscent of adoption, they are given the ἐξουσίαν to become children of God (1.12). Richey

⁸⁵ See Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, 53.18.2; Peppard, *Son of God*, 76.

⁸⁶ Suetonius, *Gal.* 17 (Rolfe, LCL). Emphasis mine.

⁸⁷ Pliny, *Panegyric to Trajan*, 8.6 (Radice, LCL).

⁸⁸ E.g., Suetonius, *Claudius* 7; and *Tiberius* 14. Also in *Augustus*, 94, doves appear the moment Julius Caesar knows he will adopt Octavian. Peppard argues on these grounds that Mark's baptism narrative "mimics the accession of imperial power." Peppard, *Son of God*, 125.

⁸⁹ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 215, n.25.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 91-98, 206-210. Similarly Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 1 (New York, Scribners, 1955), 128-129.

suggests that this claim is intended to challenge and reverse “the logic of the Imperial Cult.”⁹¹ In this context, being kept in the divine Name could indicate that believers are adopted alongside Jesus. Peppard argues that Jesus’ role as “son” is not qualitatively different from their identity as “children” of God. Jesus’ uniqueness (μονογενής) lies in his role as divine Revealer (1.14-18), not in the fact that he is “begotten,”⁹² since, as Lieu points out, believers in 1 John are also “begotten” (1 John 3.7-10; 5.1, 18).⁹³

Compelling as this Roman background may be, there are some important differences from John’s thought. Generally speaking, although the imperial ideology may well have coloured how recipients understood the “sonship” motif in GJohn, the case has been made persuasively elsewhere that the primary impetus behind John’s use of such language lies in Jewish traditions, and not in the imperial language of *divi filius*.⁹⁴ To be sure, there is a correspondence between the function of adoption to invest the son with the authority of the inherited name and the *function* of John’s Name-giving to authorize Jesus. However, the imperial ideology does not account for the *meaning* of the Name-keeping as involving fidelity or the Name-giving as entailing the sharing of divine character and prerogatives.

More significantly for our purposes, Roman adoption ideology fails to account for the associative or eschatological *significance* of the Name in John 17.11-12. As a repeatable principle of power-transfer, Roman adoption was not tied to a single climactic eschatological event, as is the Name-giving of 17.11-12. Likewise, the kind of association depicted between Father and Son in John 17 is entirely different from the relationship forged in adoption. Certainly Jesus’ identity and authority is derivative from the Father, as in adoption. However, there are no clear indications that John regards Jesus as “adopted” by the Father at all. Whereas adoption looked forward to inheritance and acquired status, John is deeply interested in the divine origin and paternity of

⁹¹ Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology*, 139.

⁹² Peppard, *Son of God*, 144.

⁹³ She says that this indicates “some degree of consanguinity between [Jesus and believers].” Judith M. Lieu, *I, II, and III John: A Commentary* (London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 230-231.

⁹⁴ See Hengel, *Son of God*, 42, 57-71. It is telling that Ashton has no discussion of imperial ideology in a chapter devoted to John’s title “Son of God.” Ashton, *Understanding*, 292-329. Even Richey acknowledges that *divi filius* cannot be simply equated with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology*, 100-101. A similar point could be made in response to the related suggestion that Thomas’ confession “my Lord and my God” is a polemic against the practice of referring to emperors as “Dominus et Deus.” E.g., Sjef van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 38-56. The phrase more likely reflects John’s familiarity with the Jewish tradition that identified the divine names YHWH and Elohim (i.e., κύριος and θεός) with divine attributes. See chapter 2, n.87.

Jesus. More specifically, in 17.11-12, the Name has not simply been transferred *from* the Father *to* the Son as in a royal succession. Instead, the Name has been redefined as essentially a shared Name—simultaneously “your Name” and given “to me.” Furthermore, if the Name-giving indicated adoption, we might expect John to extend this to believers, who are adopted in 1.12. However, although believers are *kept* in the Name, Jesus alone is *given* it. This accords with the significant fact (*pace* Peppard and Richey) that John reserves “son” language for Jesus, describing believers instead as τέκνα θεοῦ (1.12). Therefore, although the function of the Name in John 17.11-12 could possibly be indebted in part to the language of Roman adoption, we must look elsewhere for the associative and eschatological significance of the Name here, and likewise for the impetus to John’s interest in the Name category.

Early Christian Tradition

a) In the Father’s Name

One of the striking features of early Christianity is how quickly Jesus’ name took on the role occupied by the divine Name in Jewish tradition to identify the people of God.⁹⁵ Whereas believers were typically identified by Jesus’ name,⁹⁶ identification in terms of the divine Name was surprisingly rare. Apart from believers being “in God/the Father” (e.g., 1 Thess 1.1; 2 Thess 1.1), early Christian texts contain scant reference to being in or bearing the divine Name: In Acts 15.17, Luke applies the text of Joel 2 to Gentile believers, identifying them as those who “bear his Name.” The author of Ephesians notes that “every family”⁹⁷ in heaven and on earth is named (ὀνομάζεται) from (ἐξ) the Father (Eph 3.15), probably meaning the Father is the creator and origin of all things (cf. Eph 3.9). And Ignatius refers to believers in Rome as “bearers of the Father’s name” (πατρώνυμος) (Ign. Rom. 1.0).⁹⁸ In none of these passages does the Name function to authorize or legitimate Jesus. Moreover, there is no suggestion that the ὄνομα itself, which occurs only in the Acts reference, entails both Father and Son. Although the Name plays an eschatological role in Luke’s

⁹⁵ See discussion of Jesus’ name in the NT in Introduction.

⁹⁶ Believers bear Jesus’ name Mk 9.41; 1 Pet 4.16; Ign. Mag. 1.2; Ign. Phili. 6.3; Herm. 67.1; 76.3; 90.2-3; 91.5-6; 92.2; 93.3; 94.4; Ode 42.20 and are “called by” his name in 1 Clem. 64.1 (cf. Ign. Mag. 10.1?).

⁹⁷ Probably not the “whole family,” which would require an article. See Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1990), 203.

⁹⁸ In sequence with another *hapax legomenon* (χριστόνομος, occurring in some mss), πατρώνυμος may have been coined by Ignatius of Antioch. In *Hermas*, believers are identified with the “name of the Lord,” which probably refers to Jesus’ name (e.g., Herm. 67.1; 72.4).

citation of Joel 2, it is clear from the context of Acts that the concept of God's Name has been fully absorbed by Jesus's name, such that the "name of the Lord" is "the name of Jesus."⁹⁹

Similarly, in the earliest traditions, believers are baptized into *Jesus'* name.¹⁰⁰ It is only in the (arguably) later Matthean formula, known also to the Didachist and Odist, that we encounter baptism "in the name *of the Father*, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt 28.19; Did. 7.1; Ode 23.22). Nevertheless, there are some interesting parallels between this liturgical tradition and John's language of Name-keeping. First, as the Name is shared between Father and Son in John 17.11-12, so this baptismal formula conceives of a triadic "name," and the Didachist makes no effort to distinguish baptism into this "name" from the more common baptism "into the name of the Lord [i.e., Jesus]" (Did. 9.5). Second, as John's Name-keeping, bound up with keeping Jesus' words (17.6) *means* fidelity to the Name, and *functions* to identify believers, so baptism in the "name" is closely identified with obedience to Jesus' teaching (Matt 28.19-20), and baptism in Jesus' name more generally functioned as a key identity marker. Related to this, as believers are kept in the Name that they may be "one (ἐν)" (17.11), so baptism had a key unifying function: "...one Lord, one faith, one baptism..." (Eph 4.5).

Thus the baptismal formula resembles the Name-keeping in terms of meaning and function. If, as discussed in chapter 2, John is indebted to a tradition reflected similarly in both Matthew and *Didache*, it is conceivable that the baptismal formulation reflected in these texts helped to shape John 17.11-12. If so, however, John has adapted it to make it his own. In the context of a petition, John's Name-keeping describes an ongoing state of fidelity, not a single event. And his concern is fidelity to the divine revelation encountered in Jesus, not the importance of a liturgical rite.¹⁰¹ Moreover, the framing of both petition (17.11) and claim (17.12) locates the Name-keeping firmly within an eschatological framework, by which it is distinguished in significance from the Name in baptismal formulations.

⁹⁹ E.g., Acts 9.27-28.

¹⁰⁰ Acts 2.38; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5. Did. 9.5. Implied in 1 Cor 1.13-15. Possibly implied in James 2.7; Herm. 15.3.

¹⁰¹ It is possible that John uses language drawn from baptismal and Eucharistic traditions earlier in his Gospel. However, as here in John 17, his focus there does not appear to be the rites themselves, but their utility for emphasizing the importance of participating in the life of Christ made available through his death. See, e.g., Carson, 99; Keener, II: 690.

b) Name-Giving

There is clearer precedent in the NT for the idea of Jesus' being "given" the divine Name.¹⁰² Acts 2.36 notes that, "God made (ἐποίησεν) [Jesus] both 'Lord' and 'Christ,'" which may imply naming or giving to him the title κύριος, by which Luke may mean the divine Name.¹⁰³ But the category of ὄνομα is not explicitly invoked. More significantly, John could be indebted to the language of Name-giving reflected in Philippians 2.9-11: "God...gave to him the name above every name" (cf. Eph 1.21).¹⁰⁴ Paul has the same referent for ὄνομα in view as John.¹⁰⁵ And there is a rough correspondence to John 17 in the *function* of the Name to legitimate both the lofty claim made for Jesus being "Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (cf. John 5.23), and the fidelity encouraged by the confession "Jesus Christ is Lord." John's Name-giving is also broadly similar to Hebrews 1.4: "...the name he has inherited (κληρονομέω) is superior to theirs." Although many commentators take this name to be the title "Son,"¹⁰⁶ it is difficult to see how the intended referent is not the divine Name.¹⁰⁷ However, whereas the Name legitimates Jesus and his mission in John 17, it

¹⁰² Although Schnackenburg suggests a possible link between John's Name-giving and the similar phrasing of *Didache* 10.2 (τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου οὐ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν), the idea of the Name being *given* to the Son is, at best, implicit here. Schnackenburg, III: 436, n.41. Since the Didachist likely connotes here the idea of divine *revelation* to believers, this passage is treated, instead, in connection with John 17.6 (see chapter 2).

¹⁰³ This is debatable, but Kavin Rowe argues that, for Luke, Jesus' lordship *is* the lordship of God, with whom he shares in the identity of κύριος πάντων. C. Kavin Rowe, *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 111-113. And thereafter, the "name of the Lord" is interchangeable with the "name of Jesus" (e.g., Acts 9.27-28).

¹⁰⁴ Bousset is open to this possibility. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 215, n.25.

¹⁰⁵ Most commentators take the name given here to be κύριος—the Greek equivalent of YHWH—which is applied to Jesus in the universal confession "that Jesus Christ is *Lord* (κύριος)." See, e.g., Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 236-237. Similarly, in Ephesians 1.21, Jesus is exalted "above every name that is named," implying that his name is the one *unnamed* (i.e., ineffable/divine) Name.

¹⁰⁶ E.g., Harold Attridge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 47.

¹⁰⁷ "Son" is unlikely as the name of 1.4, since it cannot have belonged to the Father, and there is no indication elsewhere in Hebrews that Jesus' sonship is inherited or acquired. So Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 113. Richard Bauckham, "The Divinity of Jesus in the Letter to the Hebrews," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 239. Ellingworth's proposal that the "name" here is deliberately indefinite to entail both "son" and "priest" (cf. Heb 5.5-6; 7.28) fails to account for these difficulties. Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 106. Better is Peeler's suggestion that the inherited Name incorporates the two titles that are explicitly conferred on the Son in chapter 1: ὁ θεός (1.8) and ὁ κύριος (1.10). Peeler suggests the author of Hebrews saw these names as a unit as it appears in the LXX: ὁ κύριος ὁ θεός (e.g., Exod 34.14; Lev 8.35; Josh 7.19; Judg 4.23), and thus refers to a singular ὄνομα. Amy L. B. Peeler, *You Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: T&T Clark, 2014), 59-62.

functions in Hebrews 1 to establish Jesus' superiority—especially to angels. Moreover, the meaning of the Name seems tied to the idea of sovereign ownership described in 1.2: “whom he made heir (κληρονόμον) of all things.”

It is entirely plausible that John was familiar with the idea reflected in these passages that Jesus had been endowed with an exalted Name. The Philippian Christ-hymn, in particular, may well date from the earliest of Christian traditions, and been known and used widely.¹⁰⁸ So James McGrath argues that the polemical climate in which he judges GJohn to have been produced resulted in a heightening of this prior tradition.¹⁰⁹

However, it is interesting to note that the similarities between GJohn and earlier Christian tradition break down precisely at the level of significance. For the author of Hebrews, Jesus himself brings eschatological revelation and “purification for sins” “in these last days” (Heb 1.2); but it is unclear in 1.1-4 if the inherited Name is necessary for or the result of this eschatological mission, or if instead, it simply reflects an eternal reality. By contrast, Paul clearly regards the Name-giving as an eschatological climax. However, whereas the Name-giving in Philippians (cf. Eph 1.21) is the *consequence* or *evaluation* of Jesus' obedience in death, for John, it not only precedes Jesus' death, but is the necessary pre-condition for the mission on which he comes. The Name both authorizes Jesus for and is integral to the mission itself.¹¹⁰ Indeed, in contrast to Paul's χαρίζομαι and the κληρονομέω of Hebrews, John has incorporated the divine Name into his own “giving (δίδωμι)” motif, within which Jesus is authorized *for* his eschatological mission. Thus the impetus for John's interest in the Name must lie elsewhere.

In support of this point, it is interesting to note that, whereas the exalted Name given to Jesus in Ephesians 1.21 and Hebrews 1.4 (and possibly Phil 2.10) may represent Christological

¹⁰⁸ John may well have known the Philippian epistle. See n.104. Although the dissemination of early Christian texts was private, it was more rapid and broad than most pagan works. See Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 82-143. John's familiarity with the Christ-hymn is even more plausible if it antedated the epistle, and/or enjoyed wide liturgical use. Ralph Martin suggests, for instance, that it may have been sung during baptismal ceremonies. Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 292-294. Also Bert-Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, “The Name above all Names (Philippians 2.9),” in *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*, ed. George H. van Kooten (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 200-201. And Hengel argues that the Christ-hymn was known to the author of Hebrews, who expands it in Hebrews 1. Hengel, *Son of God*, 87-88.

¹⁰⁹ James McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 105-109.

¹¹⁰ In contrast, Paul makes few other references to the divine Name. See Introduction.

reflection on the ὁ κύριος title in Psalm 109[110], to which these passages allude,¹¹¹ John nowhere exhibits the influence of Psalm 109[110].

c) Revelation

The closest NT parallels to John 17.11-12 occur in Revelation. There are several indications that Jesus shares somehow in the divine Name. God is ascribed the epithet “the one who is and who was and is coming,” deriving from Exodus 3.14, where it is related to the divine Name (Rev 1.4, 8; 4.8). However, it is Jesus who embodies this “coming” (Rev 3.11; 22.7, 12, 20).¹¹² More poignantly, Jesus is inscribed with a secret Name, which may well be the divine Name.¹¹³ Furthermore, this name is likely Jesus’ own “new name” (3.12), which is paired with “the name of my God” in 3.12, and with “his Father’s name” in 14.1. This association of two distinct names which both evoke the divine Name category is strikingly similar to the associative significance of the Name concept in GJohn. In addition, both “names” paired together function as a seal marking believers, who are thereby identified as faithful, and consequently protected (Rev 3.12; 7.3; 14.1). This is reminiscent of the identifying function of the Name-keeping in John 17.11-12.

It seems clear that these passages and John 17 reflect the same milieu. Therefore, it will be instructive to consider what influences may have generated the Name language in Revelation. We will return to this later in the chapter. However, it should be noted that the sharing or giving of the Name to Jesus in Revelation is not subordinated to the mission of preserving faithful believers or of eschatological revelation as it is in John 17.

¹¹¹ See Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 128-132. An allusion to Psalm 109[110] is less certain in the Philippian hymn. Fuller argues that the hymn presupposes the exaltation of Psalm 109[110]. Reginald H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Scribners, 1965), 213. Also Martin, *Carmen Christi*, 259, n.3. However, as allusion is more clearly made to Isaiah 45, the exaltation language is just as likely to derive from passages in Isaiah. See discussion in chapter 1.

¹¹² See Samuel Vollenweider, “‘Der Name, der über jedem anderen Namen ist’: Jesus als Träger des Gottesnamens im neuen Testament,” in *Gott Nennen: Gottes Namen und Gott als Name*, ed. Ingolf Dalferth and Philipp Stoellger (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 175-178.

¹¹³ Although the secret Name in Revelation 19.11 could be the “Word” (v13) or the title “king of kings and lord of lords” (v16), Hannah suggests that the longer reading, which disambiguates “the name written” from “names written” upon Jesus is original—and fell out due to haplography. Furthermore, the reference to the crown (v12) evokes the image of the priestly turban, which bore the Tetragrammaton (Exod 28.36; 39.30; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.178; *War* 5.235; b. Šabb. 63b). Hannah, *Michael*, 144-145. Note that Jesus is depicted in priestly attire. See G. B. Caird, *The Revelation of St. John*, repr. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 25. In addition, the divine Name here is more plausible as an implicit contrast with the *blasphemous* names of the beast (13.1; 17.3) and harlot (17.5).

John may well have drawn on ideas reflected in various Jewish or Christian magical and mystical traditions for various aspects of the meaning or function of Name-keeping or Name-giving in John 17.

a) Name-Sealing

Earlier, it was suggested that Jesus' "sealing" (6.27) refers to the Father's giving him his Name (17.11). This link is justified by the wider Jewish tradition in which figures are "sealed" with the divine Name, which in turn, may also have influenced the Name-giving and Name-keeping language of John 17.11-12. In the ancient world, "seal" and "signature" were virtually synonymous, and a special relationship between "sealing" and the divine Name is well attested.¹¹⁴ The turban of the high priest, engraved with the divine Name,¹¹⁵ and referred to as a "seal" (σφραγίδος)¹¹⁶ identified him as consecrated. But usually the Name-seal possessed some theurgic or apotropaic function. In some texts, the Name occurs as a "seal" over creation to represent creative power.¹¹⁷ In Merkabah tradition, seals composed of various divine names granted the bearer access to levels of heaven.¹¹⁸ Similarly, later rabbis speculated that circumcised Jews were sealed by the Name and thereby gained access to Eden.¹¹⁹ And the Greek Magical Papyri contain several spells in which a divine name is used for protection.¹²⁰

In Revelation, such Name-seal associations appear to have been combined with the tradition of marking God's people with a "sign" (σημεῖον), that appears first in Ezekiel 9.4.¹²¹ In

¹¹⁴ E.g., Neh 9.38[10.1]; 10.1[2]; Esth 3.12; 8.8, 10; Jer 39[32].10. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.271; *Lives* 2.13; also Ode 23.8-9.

¹¹⁵ See Aristeas 98; Philo *Mos.* 2.114, 132. There is debate over whether the inscription bore "holy to YHWH" or simply "YHWH." See R. P. Gordon, "Inscribed Pots and Zechariah XIV 20-21," *VT* 42 (1992): 120-123.

¹¹⁶ Exod 28.36, 39.30; Sir. 45.12.

¹¹⁷ The earliest reference of this appears to be Pr. Man. 1-3 (dates vary from second century BC to first century AD), but it appears later in the rabbis as well: *Sefer Yesira* 1.3; *HekhZ* 367; *HekhR.* 23; cf. Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 28.30. See Fossum, *Name of God*, 245-253.

¹¹⁸ E.g., *HekhR* 219, 236. For further list of scholarship, see Wolfson, "Circumcision," 84, n.17.

¹¹⁹ Note in some earlier texts, the Name here is *Shaddai*, but in the thirteenth century, the same role is played by the Tetragrammaton. See Wolfson, "Circumcision," 77-112.

¹²⁰ E.g., PGM I.146; VII.490-504; XII.6-20.

¹²¹ Similarly, σημεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ in Pss. Sol. 15.6-9. Also, one Qumran text (CD 19.7-14) combines the shepherd in Zechariah 13 with the protective "mark" of Ezekiel 9.4. See also Isa 44.5.

Revelation 7.3-8, the 144 000 are sealed (σφραγίζω) with what is most likely the divine Name—since the divine Name is “written” on believers (Rev 3.14), in contrast to the “name of the Beast,” by which the wicked are marked (Rev 13.17; 14.11). Jesus also has a secret name “written” on him (Rev 19.12), which seems distinguished from the divine Name, and yet functions along with the divine Name as the seal identifying and consequently protecting believers (Rev 3.12; 7.2).¹²²

John 17.11-12 features a set of ideas strikingly similar to Revelation. Jesus is given the Father’s own Name. And believers are to be “kept” in this Name, and consequently protected from evil (17.17), in contrast to the “son of perdition,” who is excluded from the sphere of the Name (17.12) and identified elsewhere with Satan (13.30). Thus, not only does the “sealing” in John 6.27 likely refer to the Name-giving, it is also plausible that 17.11-12 draws on concepts related to Name-seal traditions similar to those reflected in Revelation. However, as discussed earlier, the Name itself is not apotropaic in function in 17.11. And, in contrast to Jewish traditions in which the faithful are “sealed” with the Name, John makes a clear distinction between believers who are “kept” in the Name and Jesus, who alone is given the Name. Moreover, it is only in GJohn that the Name is distinctively eschatological in significance—given to the Son so that he may achieve the eschatological mission of revealing the Name and keeping believers in it.

b) *Odes of Solomon*

Notable among the many similarities of language and emphasis shared between the *Odes of Solomon*¹²³ and GJohn are those related to the meaning and function of Name-keeping in John 17.11. First, two odes convey the idea of believers being identified by the Name. In Ode 25.11, the ambiguous speaker exults, “I became the Lord’s by the name of the Lord.” As the “Lord” is often Christ in the *Odes* (Ode 29.6), a redeemed believer may here be referring to belonging to *Christ* in terms of either the name of Christ or of God, who is addressed in verse 1. However, if Christ himself is the speaker, then he is identified as belonging to God in terms of the divine Name.¹²⁴ The former option is more likely in light of Ode 42.20, where the Saviour comments, “I placed my name upon their head, because they are free and they are mine” (Ode 42.20). Untergassmair’s

¹²² See n.113.

¹²³ Of the *Odes* discussed here, only *Odes* 5 and 25 are preserved in the third century *Pistis Sophia*. The others survive only in late medieval Syriac manuscripts (Codices Nitriensis and Harris). The *Odes* likely date from the early second century. See Michael Lattke, *Odes of Solomon: A Commentary*, trans. Marianne Ehrhardt (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 1-10.

¹²⁴ Lattke, *Odes*, 366-367.

suggestion that both passages (25.11; 42.20) reflect “ein ‘Ineinssein mit dem Herrn’ aufgrund der Namensbesiegelung” oversimplifies matters.¹²⁵ The divine Name category has been deployed for the names of both God and Christ. Moreover, the language here is more reminiscent of the Aaronic blessing or perhaps *Psalms of Solomon* 9.9 “you put your name on us, O Lord.” And the Name here is a symbol of ownership, not an apotropaic seal.¹²⁶

Second, name language functions in the *Odes* to connote fidelity. In Ode 8, the speaker—most likely Christ, the Beloved—says, “they shall not be deprived of my name, for it is with them” (v19). At first glance, it seems the name of Christ here has acquired the function of a divine hypostasis.¹²⁷ However, the theme of the ode is abiding and fidelity, expressed from both sides: On the one hand, believers are exhorted to hear and receive knowledge (v8), and abide in the love of the Lord (v20), kept “in Him who lives” and “saved in Him who was saved” (v21). On the other hand, the Beloved has identified his own by sealing them (v13), whom he knows (vv. 12, 18), and with whom he remains (v12). This relationship is preserved through various means: Believers are “kept” by “my mystery” and “my faith” (v10) and will be found “incorrupt” “on account of the name of your Father” (v22). In this context, it seems the abiding name of verse 19 represents this two-sided fidelity: Believers do not depart from the Name, and it abides with them. The name is the locus of fidelity.

In Ode 39, this function is shared by both the divine Name and the name of Christ. The ode presents faithfulness in the metaphor of crossing a raging river. Believers cross without hindrance who do so “in faith” (v5), “faultlessly” (v6), and “in the name of the Lord” (v7). Thus, when the Odist promises safe crossing to those who “put on the name of the Most High” (v8), he likely means the fidelity of the believer, and not the apotropaic protection of a hypostatic name.¹²⁸ However, the “way” across the river is the “Lord” (v7), i.e., the Christ (vv.9-11). Thus putting on the divine Name is folded into the notion of “adoring” the “name” of Christ (v13).

As in John 17, so in the *Odes*, the Name functions to identify believers and means fidelity to God. Since Untergassmair incorrectly judges the Name in Ode 25 to be apotropaic, it may be an overstatement to say that John 17 has a “völlig anderen theologischen Hintergrund.”¹²⁹ Moreover,

¹²⁵ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 323.

¹²⁶ Lattke, *Odes*, 604-605.

¹²⁷ So Lattke, *Odes*, 125-126.

¹²⁸ The “Most High” is always the Father in the *Odes*. E.g., Ode 9.5; 12.4; 23.18; 31.4; 41.13.

¹²⁹ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 324.

the artificial division made here between the names of the Father and of Christ in the *Odes* obscures the fact that the divine Name category is applied equally and with ease to both. And both names are interchangeable as the locus of fidelity—not unlike John 17.

Nevertheless, we cannot make much of these parallels. Since the Odist has likely derived some of his language and concepts from GJohn,¹³⁰ the *Odes* lend additional support to the proposed meaning and function of the Name in John 17.11-12 outlined earlier. However, they fail to shed additional light on the impetus for John's own interest in the Name category. Untergassmair rightly points out that Name-revelation on which fidelity to the Name depends in John 17 is absent from the *Odes*.¹³¹ More significantly, there is no eschatological significance attached to the divine Name in the *Odes*.

c) Nag Hammadi Texts

There are two references in the *Nag Hammadi* texts to a figure being given the divine Name. The first is found in the *Gospel of Truth*:

Now the name of the Father is the Son. It is he who first gave a name to the one who came forth from him, who was himself, and he begot him as a son. He gave him his name which belonged to him. (38.7-12).

But the Son existed; he alone was given a name. The name therefore is that of the Father, as the name of the Father is the Son. (39.23-27)

Similarly, the *Gospel of Philip* refers to “the name which the Father gave to the Son...the name above all things: the name of the Father” (Gos. Phil. 54.6-8).¹³²

As discussed in chapter 2, the Name here means the principle of divine life, and the conflation of the “Son” with the Name (Gos. Truth 38.7) represents the self-knowledge of divine origin. Furthermore, the Name-giving represents God's giving his very being to the Son, who consequently is granted self-knowledge.¹³³ In contrast with GJohn, the Gnostic Name-giving is not

¹³⁰ Lattke, *Odes*, 13-14. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 314.

¹³¹ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 306-361, esp. 324.

¹³² Translation from “The Gospel of Philip,” trans. Wesley Isenberg, in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 3rd ed., ed. James Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 142-143. The *Gospel of Philip* may date from the third century, but has a Valentinian flavour, like the *Gospel of Truth*. See *ibid.*, 141.

¹³³ See Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 255-256. Cf. Gos. Truth 27.26-33. Philo may reflect a similar idea when he notes that Adam did not name himself because he was “ignorant of himself and his own nature” (*Leg.* 1.91-92). Mortley suggests a similarity between the *Gospel of Truth* and Philo. Mortley, “The Name of the Father is the Son,” 244. But any similarity is largely superficial.

tied to an earthly mission of revelation or to the locus of fidelity or of the identity of the people of God. In addition, the Gnostic Name is simply conflated with the Son: “the Name of the Father *is* the Son” (Gos. Truth 38.7). By contrast, John never does this,¹³⁴ but rather deploys the divine Name as a bridging concept which entails both Father and Son. Thus, although the authors of these Gnostic texts may have been influenced by the language of John 17.11,¹³⁵ they deployed John’s language in fundamentally different ways than he intended. They shed little light on the impetus behind John’s own use of the Name in his Name-giving expression.¹³⁶

Name Angel Traditions

One set of traditions which may have influenced the Name-giving language that occurs in John 17, as well as Paul and Hebrews, arose primarily out of speculation surrounding the identity of the angel in whom God placed his Name in Exodus 23.20-21(MT): “for my name is in¹³⁷ him (בְּקִרְבּוֹ).”¹³⁸ Although many Jewish texts feature exalted principal agent figures, the discussion will be limited here to those passages in which distinguishable figures are given or otherwise associated with the divine Name in particular.¹³⁹

a) Joseph and Aseneth

As relevant passages in *Aseneth* and 1 Enoch have been treated at length already in the preceding chapter, it is necessary only to highlight their relevance for the question of Name-giving. In *Aseneth*, a heavenly figure with a secret name appears to Aseneth as the agent of her transformation. The secret name of the angel could identify him as the Name Angel. However,

¹³⁴ So Shirbroun, “Giving,” 285. Pace Gieschen, “Divine Name,” 135-136.

¹³⁵ Craig A. Evans, Robert L. Webb, and Richard A. Wiebe, eds., *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 39-40. The *Gospel of Philip* more likely draws upon Philippians 2.9. Ibid., 148.

¹³⁶ See, e.g., Hengel, *Son of God*, 33-35.

¹³⁷ The LXX ἐπ’ αὐτῷ is less striking.

¹³⁸ Several scholars have made this suggestion. E.g., Fossum, “Onomanology,” 117-133; Brown, II: 755; Ashton, *Understanding*, 81-83; Hannah, *Michael*, 146-147. In a footnote, Peder Borgen suggests that the “sealing” (6.27) be likened to these traditions. Peder Borgen, “John 6,” 100, n.20. Carson suggests Thomas’ confession reflects the influence of Name Angel traditions. Carson, 658. Also, Gieschen, following Fossum, suggests that the Name Angel tradition provides the background for Jesus’ claim “Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8.58), and for what he regards to be the presentation of Jesus as the hypostatic divine Name. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 276-280; Idem, “Divine Name,” 141.

¹³⁹ This excludes those passages which speculate solely on angelic names, or on exalted angels who are not identified with the divine Name.

even if the text implies he is endowed with the divine Name, the name shifts attention from the angel himself, by identifying him primarily as an agent of God. There is no indication that, in bearing this name, the angel himself is identified as the locus of fidelity to God. The name is not associative. Moreover, whereas the mission of the angel is to transform Aseneth in a rehabilitated patriarchal narrative, Jesus' is given the Name to achieve the eschatological mission of Name-revelation and to preserve believers in the Name.

b) 1 Enoch

In 1 Enoch 69.14-15, Michael possesses secret knowledge of what is likely the divine Name:

...and [Kesbeel] spoke to Michael to disclose to him his secret name so that he would memorize this secret name of his, so that he would call it up in an oath in order that they shall tremble before it and the oath...he placed this oath in Michael's hand.

Hannah and Gieschen both argue that the text implies that Michael has been entrusted with the divine Name by God.¹⁴⁰ It should be noted, however, that the translation of the verse is by no means obvious. The natural referent of the one who gives the oath to Michael is Kesbeel, not God, who is not mentioned at all in the preceding context.¹⁴¹ Even if it is granted that *God* entrusts Michael with his Name, the sense is simply that Michael possesses knowledge of the Name—meaning access to creative power. There is no indication that the Name functions to authorize Michael himself. Moreover, his knowledge of the Name does not identify him as the locus of fidelity to God, nor is it tied to any eschatological mission of revelation or salvation.

The references to both the secret (divine) Name and the name of the son of man may imply the Name has an associative significance not unlike in GJohn. However, this is muted, since the son of man figure himself does not appear to be the locus of the fidelity or identity of the people of God. Moreover, the identification of the Enochic son with the divine Name is not integral to any eschatological mission, but rather follows his exaltation, as in Philippians 2.

¹⁴⁰ Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 76-77; Hannah, *Michael*, 52.

¹⁴¹ Thus, translations of the subject here vary between the "evil one" (Isaac, Charlesworth), God (Black), or an ambiguous "he" (Charles, Knibb, Nickelsburgh/Vanderkam).

c) Philo

Philo was clearly familiar with Exodus 23.20-21, from which he cites twice.¹⁴² In one of these instances, he identifies the Name angel as λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν (*Agr.* 51), which suggests that his identification elsewhere of the figure bearing these titles as the ὄνομα θεοῦ (*Conf.* 146) may also reflect the influence of Exodus 23. In a similar vein, for Philo, the title κύριος applies, not to God, but to a distinguishable figure—usually the *Logos*—who represents a divine accommodation to human limitation (e.g., *Heir* 170). Philo interprets Deuteronomy 6.13 (“you will swear by his name”) as an injunction to swear by the Name of the Lord who is “the interpreting *Logos*” (*Leg.* 3.207). Furthermore, he describes the seal on the high priestly turban (i.e., ἀγίασμα κυρίῳ) in language parallel to that used to describe the *Logos* (cf. *Migr.* 6): “But that seal is the form of forms, by which God fashioned the world—indeed an incorporeality, perceptible only to the mind” (*Migr.* 103). Similarly, when Abraham sees “the Lord,” it is not God himself, but his kingly power, which is designated κύριος (*Mut.* 15), that Abraham sees. Thus for Philo, the divine Name is distinguishable from God, and yet simultaneously an aspect of divinity which can be apprehended by humans. In short, it is directly analogous to Philo’s *Logos* concept.¹⁴³

Although Philo and GJohn share several common features, there is little common ground here: Whereas Philo takes the divine Name to mean the figure himself—almost as a hypostasis—John never identifies the Name as Jesus. Moreover, for Philo, the Name category is merely the object of ontological speculation, not rooted in or grounding for historic eschatological mission.

d) *Apocalypse of Abraham*

One of the clearest examples of the divine Name Angel tradition in Jewish literature is found in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.¹⁴⁴ God sends to Abraham his chief angel, Yahoel, who is

¹⁴² In *Migr.* 174, he identifies the guiding angel of Exodus 23 with divine reason (λόγῳ θεϊῳ), and elsewhere as right reason (τὸν ὀρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον), like a royal viceroy (ὑπαρχος), and as the firstborn son (πρωτόγονον υἱόν) (*Agr.* 51).

¹⁴³ So Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 148. Hannah is perhaps too cautious in saying only that there was “some connection” between Name and *Logos* in Philo. Hannah, *Michael*, 88.

¹⁴⁴ Translations from “Apocalypse of Abraham,” trans. R. Rubinkiewicz, in *OTP*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 689-705. The document is likely roughly contemporary with GJohn—sometime between AD70 and the mid-second century—since reference is made to the Temple destruction in chapter 27 on the one hand, and it was known to Origen on the other. The extant medieval manuscripts (preserved only in Slavonic, although Hebrew may underlie this) exhibit Christian interpolations, especially in the latter portion of the apocalypse. Thus caution must be used in making too much of the contents. Nonetheless, it likely contains traditions, which existed in embryonic form in the first century. See *Ibid.*, 683-684.

implicitly identified as the angel of Exodus 23.20-21 when he refers to "...the medium of his ineffable Name *in me*" (10.8), and later claims: "Behold, I am assigned (to be) with you and with the generation which is predestined (to be born) from you" (10.16).¹⁴⁵ The referent of the Name is most likely the Tetragrammaton, as may be signaled by the angel's theophoric name, which includes "Iao," a common variant for YHWH.¹⁴⁶ And the Name *functions* to authorize and to enable Yahoel in his commission to consecrate and strengthen Abraham (10.3), which is expounded in the context: "I am sent" (10.6, 13); "I was called [Yahoel] by [God]" (10.7-8); "I am the one who has been charged according to his commandment..." (10.9); "I am appointed..." (10.10); "I am ordered..." (10.11); "I am assigned (to be) with you..." (10.16). Thus, as in John 17, the Name *functions* to authorize a distinguishable figure for mission.¹⁴⁷

However, the parallel breaks down at the level of *significance*. In contrast with GJohn, Yahoel's mission is not eschatological. He is simply a character in a patriarchal narrative. He is not given the divine Name in order to achieve an eschatological mission, or even to reveal either the Name or God himself. Rather, God himself reveals the future to Abraham (8.3; 9.6; 19.1-32.6), as Abraham had petitioned: "If [only] God will reveal himself by himself to us" (7.11). Moreover the Name has no *associative* significance. The fact that Yahoel bears the Name does not expand the divine Name category itself or identify Yahoel or his own name (Yahoel) as the locus of fidelity to God. Indeed, the author may well have used the Name category precisely to counteract the tendency in mystical Jewish traditions to present God in visual or corporeal terms.¹⁴⁸ Ultimately, Yahoel is only an "angel," along with others "with [him] in the seventh expanse" (10.7; cf. 19.8), including Michael (10.18). Interestingly, the messiah figure is described in terms similar to Yahoel:

¹⁴⁵ Rubinkiewicz notes a medieval Bogomil editor may have interpolated 10.6-12—although he gives no reason for this. Only one (albeit the earliest) of the six extant medieval manuscripts reads "ineffable" in verse 8, where the others have "speakable." "Apocalypse of Abraham," (Rubinkiewicz), 694. However, there are no variants surrounding the "ineffable Name" in 10.3. Thus the text of chapter 10 as it stands in Rubinkiewicz's translation is likely original.

¹⁴⁶ Van Kooten argues that "Iao" was a Jewish designation for the divine Name revealed to Moses, but which was also widely known in pagan circles. Van Kooten, "Moses and Iao," 107-138. However, little is made of this name. Bauckham suggests that "Yahoel" signals no more as a name than "Elijah" (which also means YHWH is God). Richard Bauckham, "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 226-227.

¹⁴⁷ Ashton, *Understanding*, 81. Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, 2d ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 87-88.

¹⁴⁸ See Andrei Orlov, "Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*," *JBL* 127 (2008): 53-70.

“I will send my chosen one, *having in him* one measure of all my *power*...” (31.1; cf. 10.8).

Furthermore, although Yahoel bears the divine Name, he is not worshiped or invoked,¹⁴⁹ or identified as YHWH.¹⁵⁰ Similarly, neither Yahoel nor his own name function as the basis for the identity of God’s people. This is all the more significant, since, as a re-telling of Genesis 15, the *Apocalypse* is greatly interested in those who are called to be the people of God.¹⁵¹ If Yahoel himself were significant for the identity of the community, it would have been made explicit.

e) *Prayer of Joseph*

The *Prayer of Joseph* identifies the two disputants in Genesis 32.24-31 as the angels Israel and Uriel.¹⁵² The designation of Israel as “firstborn” and one who “sees God” is reminiscent of the figure in Philo’s *De Confusione Linguarum* 146, whom it was noted earlier is also identified as the “Name of God.”¹⁵³ Yet no such identification occurs in the *Prayer*. In the dispute, the significance of names for ranking angels is highlighted, and it is possible that Uriel lays claim to having the name that is “before every angel”—which could be the divine Name. Yet the translation here is difficult, and regardless, the claim turns out to be false.¹⁵⁴ The only unambiguous reference to the

¹⁴⁹ It is rather the “Eternal One” whom Abraham invokes (10.14), and whom both he and Yahoel worship (17.2-5). Gieschen regards Abraham’s hymn of praise as worship given to the angel, because it includes his name: “Most Glorious El, El, El, El, Yahoel, you are he who my soul has loved, my protector.” Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 144. However, it is better to see this as reinforcing the *distinction* between the angel and the significance of his Name, for it is the angel Yahoel who teaches Abraham this hymn as a hymn of praise to God and then instructs him to do so at the approach of YHWH. In the context, it is not directed toward the angel.

¹⁵⁰ Pace Fossum, *Name of God*, 318-321.

¹⁵¹ See, e.g., 22.5; 29.17.

¹⁵² Translation from “Prayer of Joseph,” trans. J. Z. Smith, in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 713. It is possible that the *Prayer of Joseph* was influenced by Christian ideas, especially as it is preserved only in Origen, who cites it in his John commentary (2.31). It could even be Christian anti-Jewish polemic. However scholars generally regard a first century Jewish provenance as most likely. Ibid., 700-701. Segal, *Two Powers*, 200. It must pre-date Origen, who cites it. But whether or not it predates GJohn or Philo is a matter of debate.

¹⁵³ Hannah, *Michael*, 89.

¹⁵⁴ Uriel refers to a name that is “before every angel” (v6), by which he means either his own name, or the divine Name. The sentence can be rendered one of two ways: “...saying that his name and the name that is before every angel was to be above mine” or “...saying that his name should have precedence over my name and of the angel that is before all.” See Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 713, n.L. The fact that Israel’s name in fact is exalted above Uriel’s or the name of the highest angel could implicitly identify Israel with the divine Name. But no such identification is made explicit.

divine Name comes at the end, when Israel, the highest ranking angel, invokes God “by the inextinguishable name.”¹⁵⁵

There is little here that relates directly to the Name-giving of John 17.¹⁵⁶ The *Prayer* merely attests to the importance of the Name in speculations surrounding the relationship of angelic figures to God. Names indicate status: The higher the name, the closer to God himself is the figure to which that name is attached. At the most, the divine Name functions here to authorize angelic figures. There is no associative or eschatological significance to speak of.

f) *Memar Marqah*

Although the Samaritan text *Memar Marqah*¹⁵⁷ also alludes to Exodus 23.20-21,¹⁵⁸ it exhibits even greater interest in the text in which Moses is made “as God to Pharaoh” (Exod 7.1MT).¹⁵⁹ This text undergirds several related passages in which Moses is “vested” with the Name,¹⁶⁰ or “given” the name.¹⁶¹ The same text likely legitimates the striking statement in IV.1:

¹⁵⁵ The term ἄσβεστος rendered “inextinguishable name” is rare, occurring in the later Christian text of Esaias, *Oratio* 4.9. Smith, “Prayer of Joseph,” 701, n.5.

¹⁵⁶ Note however Israel’s tabernacling (κατασκηνώω) among men is reminiscent of John 1.14.

¹⁵⁷ *Memar Marqah* probably dates from the second, third, and fourth centuries AD. Translations from *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah*, ed. John MacDonald (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelman, 1963). However, the earliest manuscript is fourteenth century, so here “we are dealing with the literary products of a living religion with a long history.” James D. Purvis, “The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans,” in *The Composition of John’s Gospel: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 152. Also, it should not be assumed that the *Memar Marqah* is representative of uniform Samaritan thought, which itself is implausible. Debate continues over whether there is any relationship between GJohn and Samaritan traditions. MacDonald argues that the earliest Samaritan texts exhibit the influence of GJohn, and that the concept of Name-giving may derive from the New Testament. John MacDonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 185-186, 420-486.

¹⁵⁸ The Exodus 23 angel is identified as “the Glory” in *Memar Marqah* III.5, and as “my Apostle” in the Samaritan Targum of Exodus 23.20-22.

¹⁵⁹ Jewish traditions similarly draw on this and other passages to exalt Moses (Midr. Lev 1.1; Sir. 45.1-5; Ezek. Trag. 68-80). 3 Enoch 10-14 and Philo’s *De vita Mosis* 1.58 (cf. *Somn.* 1.189; *Mut.* 128-129) imply his deification. See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 148-149.

¹⁶⁰ *Memar Marqah* I.9; II.12; IV.2, 7; V.1.

¹⁶¹ He is given the Name “so that he need not fear” (*Memar Marqah* I.3), and by it he “slew the unbelievers” (*Memar Marqah* II.12). See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 235.

“Where is there a prophet like Moses, and who can compare with Moses, whose name was made the Name of his Lord?”¹⁶²

In contrast with the other texts surveyed thus far, the *referent* of the Name with which Moses is vested is not the divine Name, which is revealed to him, but *Elohim*:

The first name, with which Genesis opens, was that which he was vested with and by which he was made strong: *See I make you as God to Pharaoh* (Exod 7.1)...[But] *I am who I am* (Exod 3.14) I have revealed to you” (II.12; cf. V.1).¹⁶³

The *function* of the Name in these passages seems to be both to assure Moses of divine presence (I.3), and to exalt and empower Moses himself (II.12; IV.2). It is only secondarily that the Name functions to legitimate a lofty view of Moses in a way roughly analogous to GJohn.

The *significance* of the Name in *Memar Marqah* has even less in common with GJohn. To be sure, the Name concept may be regarded as “associative” in some sense: Moses’ own name is taken up into the Name he bears, as Jesus’ own name acquires significance in GJohn. However, the direction seems to be unilateral. Moses’ name is taken up into or absorbed by the Name he bears, but the Name he bears is not thereby redefined as “the Name given to Moses.” In addition, the Name is not eschatological in significance, but simply “the first name, with which Genesis opens” (II.12). And it is not given to Moses that he may accomplish a particularly eschatological mission, such as revealing God or his Name, nor does the given Name function thereby to identify the people of God.¹⁶⁴

g) Angelomorphic Priesthood

The Name-sealing tradition, discussed earlier, included the high priest who bore the Tetragrammaton on his turban. In at least one Qumran passage, this aspect of the high priestly role appears to have contributed to the description of what Crispin Fletcher-Louis calls an “angelomorphic priesthood:”

May you be like an angel of the face in the holy residence for the glory of the God of the Hos[ts...] ...May he make you ho[ly] among his people, like a luminary [...] for the world in knowledge, and to shine on the face of the Many [... And may he make you] a diadem

¹⁶² This conflation appears to be based on the word-play between *שמע* and *שמע* (Exod 6.29-7.1MT). Marc Philonenko, *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 178, n.7.

¹⁶³ This is in spite of the fact that his name is called “the divine name” in I.1.

¹⁶⁴ Even anticipation of an *eschatological* “prophet like Moses” does not seem to have emerged in Samaritan circles until long after the first century. Purvis “The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans,” 176.

of the holy of holies, because [you shall be made ho]ly for him and you shall glorify his name and his holy things (1Q28b col. IV.25-28).

As an “angel of the presence/face” who gives “light,” the figure addressed here appears to embody the role of the blessing mediated by the priest in Numbers 6.24-26 that God would make his face “to shine” on his people.¹⁶⁵ Yet interestingly, the holy status by which this figure can embody divine presence is reflected implicitly in the role he has in glorifying the divine Name (col. IV.28), which he achieves because he is empowered by that Name (col.V.28). His glorification of the Name may refer simply to praise. However it appears (despite the lacuna in IV.28) that he himself is made a “diadem (נִזָּר)” which must refer to the diadem (נִזָּר) bearing the Tetragrammaton he would wear (Exod 29.6; 39.30). He embodies the Name he bears.¹⁶⁶ So Fletcher-Louis suggests, “[t]he high priest brings Glory to God’s Name by virtue of his capacity as bearer of that Name and its visible manifestation.”¹⁶⁷

There may be a trace of associative significance in the Name language here. On the one hand, it is clearly the Name of God, while on the other, the priest is made the diadem.

Furthermore, if the priest bears the Name implicitly here, it is for the purpose of revelation: “...to give *light* [...] for the world in knowledge, and to *illuminate* the face of the Many...” (4.27).

However, much of this is inferred. More importantly, neither the revelation itself, nor the Name which enables it, is eschatological in significance.

In conclusion, it is likely that John would have been familiar with some form of the Name Angel tradition outlined here.¹⁶⁸ As in John 17, the implied *referent* of the Name in most of these texts is YHWH/κύριος, and the *function* of the divine Name is often to legitimate or authorize the

¹⁶⁵ See Crispin Fletcher-Louis, “Some Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity Texts Among the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 308-309. The Aaronic blessing is evoked elsewhere in the DSS: 1QS 2.2-4; 4Q452 col.1, *frag.* 1.1; 11Q14 col. 1, *frag.* 2.7.

¹⁶⁶ It is unclear why Fletcher-Louis is resistant to this idea, particularly as it would strengthen his larger argument. *Ibid.*, 310.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 311.

¹⁶⁸ The tradition is reflected positively in this wide range of texts, and negatively in reactions to it occurring in the LXX and rabbis. E.g., Isa 63.9; b. Sukkah 45b, b. Sanh. 63a, Midr. Exod 43.3. And the *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael* avoids discussion of Exodus 23.21 altogether. See John Ashton, *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 78-79. Moreover, the figure of Exodus 23.20-21 has likely influenced early Christian texts and ideas. E.g., Mk 1.2; Jude 5; Justin Martyr *Dial.* 75. Possibly also Rev 19. See Hannah, *Michael*, 139-140, 145.

figure in question. Thus, it is certainly plausible that Name Angel traditions helped facilitate John's identification of Jesus with the divine Name category.

However, John does not allude anywhere to Exodus 23, or describe the Name as being "in" Jesus, or indeed attempt to present Jesus as an angelic figure at all.¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, there is no observable uniformity of *meaning* for the Name between these texts: In Philo the Name is identified with the figure himself. In *Aseneth* it connotes the undisclosed mystery that surrounds the angel figure. And in 1 Enoch, it means creative power. For John, by contrast, the Name means divine character and prerogatives in action. More significantly, only in GJohn does the Name have eschatological *significance*. By contrast, although the angelic figures may bear divine messages, they never reveal God himself or his Name. They themselves are figures from antiquity, or objects of speculation, but not the agents of eschatological mission.¹⁷⁰ And although name language is associative, linking two figures in 1 Enoch 69 and perhaps also in *Memar Marqah*, only in GJohn is the divine Name radically redefined as *the Name, which you gave me*. Only in GJohn is Jesus' identification with the divine Name constitutive of divine self-revelation and the identity and fidelity of the people of God, and thereby legitimating Jesus himself and his own name. It may, therefore, be concluded that Name Angel traditions fail to account fully for John's Jesus in general, or his interest in the divine Name category in particular. Although he may well have drawn upon them, the generative force behind his interest in the Name was not speculation, but eschatological conviction.

OT Naming Tradition

Although the meaning or function of the Name in John 17.11-12 could be indebted to a variety of traditions, it is worth noting that the OT itself uses the Name in ways roughly analogous to GJohn. For John, the Name in the Name-keeping expression is the locus of fidelity, resulting in the protection of believers, and it functions to identify them as the people of God—his possession. The same elements converge in the Aaronic blessing in Numbers 6.23-24: "...And they

¹⁶⁹ As Hannah says, this is "probably significant." Hannah, *Michael*, 146. There is an increasing appreciation within scholarship for the influence of angelology upon the Christology of NT authors. See Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 112; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*; Stuckenbruck, "'Angels' and 'God,'" 70; Idem, *Angel Veneration*, 273. However, Hannah is correct in his judgment that, although John may have appropriated the Name Angel tradition, he has transformed it and moved beyond it. Hannah, *Michael*, 146.

¹⁷⁰ J. D. G. Dunn, "Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 329.

will place my name on the sons of Israel, and I, the Lord, will bless them: ‘The Lord bless you and keep you...’.” Those bearing the Name are *kept* (φυλάσσω) by the Lord (Num 6.23-24), which probably connotes protection.¹⁷¹ And, although not explicit in Numbers 6, the divine Name was the primary identity marker for those who bore it, representing their covenant relationship with God.¹⁷² As God claimed ownership of the Temple by placing his Name upon it,¹⁷³ so also the Name designates Israel here as God’s possession.¹⁷⁴ This is made explicit in Isaiah: “...you are *mine*...as many as are called *by my name*” (Isa 43.1, 5-7).¹⁷⁵ And, since the Name signified God’s exclusive sovereignty over all other gods in the Exodus (Exod 12.12), it is the locus of Israel’s ultimate expression of covenant fidelity: the *Shema* (Deut 6.4). Likewise, the eschatological people of God were identified as those who know the divine Name (Isa 52.6; cf. Jer 16.21), or call upon that Name (cf. Isa 48.1; 64.7; 65.1). John’s “Name-keeping” resonates with this broader tradition.¹⁷⁶

To a lesser degree, the function of John’s Name-giving to authorize Jesus for mission is reminiscent of a wider biblical tradition in which an individual is set apart for a special role or mission by being “named” or distinguished by the divine Name. The Name inscribed on the high priest’s turban functioned to set him apart for priestly ministry, and the Name authorized the Exodus 23 angel for his mission of protection and discipline. Isaiah is among the first to use this language of a figure who is bound up with eschatological expectation: The naming of the Servant

¹⁷¹ The Aaronic blessing forms the basis for similar benedictions which add “from evil” (1 Chr 4.10; Ps. 120[121].7; cf. 1QS 2.2-3; 1QM 14.9-10; 11Q14 *frag* 1 col. II; cf. 4Q285 *frag*.1; 4Q504 *frags*. 1-2 col II.12; 1Q28b col.II.2, 22, col. III.1). And Tg. Ps.-J. Numbers 6.24 adds “from demons” to the keeping. See Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Protect Them from the Evil One (John 17.15): Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Mary Coloe and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 139-160.

¹⁷² Isa 44.5; 62.2; Am 9.12; Sir. 36.17; Pss. Sol. 9.9.

¹⁷³ E.g., 1 Kgs 8.43; 2 Chr 6.33; Jer 7.11, 14, 20; 39[32].34; 41[34].15. Note the contrast between the divine Name and the “gods” whom he displaces (Deut 12.2-4).

¹⁷⁴ Sandra Richter argues on the basis of the related Akkadian phrase *šuma šakānu* that the placement of the divine Name in the Temple was used to denote ownership. Richter, *Name Theology*, esp. 143-144.

¹⁷⁵ Also Isa 44.5; Jer 14.9; 15.16. One rabbinic text (Midr. Exod 15.17) identifies the idea of each Israelite being “inscribed” with the Name with Isaiah 49.7, perhaps because the idea occurs throughout Isaiah 40-66.

¹⁷⁶ There are resonances with the Aaronic blessing in particular. The testamentary character of Jesus’ prayer functions similarly to the patriarchal blessings (Gen 49, Deut 32, Jub. 1.19-21; 10.3-6, 20-22; 36.17). Discussion in Schnackenburg, III: 198. Käsemann, *Testament*, 4. More specifically, as many Jewish traditions identify the Blessing with protection “from evil” (see n.171), so Jesus prays for protection from “the evil one” (17.15). And Jesus’ petition that believers “may see my glory” (17.24) may resonate with the blessing that the Lord “make his face to appear (ἐπιφάναι) upon you” (Num 6.25).

in Isaiah 49.1 functions to set him apart for a special role. Although being “named” does not itself indicate the divine Name,¹⁷⁷ the author of 1 Enoch seems to have regarded the Servant’s naming here with greater significance.¹⁷⁸ Similarly, the famous “son of God” fragment (4Q246) more explicitly identifies an eschatological figure with the divine Name:

4Q246 col I. 7-9, col II.1: “...and he will be great over all the earth [...] they [will d]o, and all will serve [...] great will he be called and he will be designated by his name (וְשֵׁם יְתִכְנֶה). He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High...”¹⁷⁹

Collins argues that, since the figure named is the son himself, not one of his offspring, the name with which he is identified here is divine.¹⁸⁰ As the primary background for other aspects of the fragment are biblical (i.e., from Dan, 2 Sam 7, and Ps 2), and not, e.g., Akkadian prophecy or Antiochus IV,¹⁸¹ it is probable that the naming likewise derives from this wider biblical tradition.¹⁸²

Interestingly, some of the NT parallels to John’s Name-giving concept noted earlier are clear attempts to position Jesus within this naming tradition. Luke 1.32-35 exhibits strong parallels with 4Q246: “He will be great, and will be called the son of the Most High...he will be called son of God.” And the author of Hebrews links the divine Name with Jesus’ sonship in a similar fashion to 4Q246: “...the name he has inherited is superior to theirs. For to which of the angels did God once say, ‘you are my son; I have begotten you today?’” (Heb 1.4-5). In Acts 2.36, God “made” Jesus to be “Lord,” which may imply granting him this Name; and Paul may use a divine passive to make a

¹⁷⁷ See, e.g., Gen 21.12; 35.10; Eccl 6.10; Isa 1.26; Jer 3.17; 23.6; Zech 8.3; 1 En. 48.2-3; Jub. 1.25; T. Levi 8.14.

¹⁷⁸ See discussion of 1 En. 48.2-3; 69.27 in chapter 1.

¹⁷⁹ Other translation possibilities include “by his name shall he be named” (J. A. Fitzmyer); “by his name he shall be surnamed” (F. M. Cross).

¹⁸⁰ The text “requires that some reference to God/the Most High be restored in the lacuna as the antecedent of ‘his name’.” John J. Collins, “The Background of the ‘Son of God’ Text,” *BBR* 7 (1997): 57. See also Tucker S. Ferda, “Naming the Messiah: A Contribution to the 4Q246 ‘Son of God’ Debate,” *DSD* 21 (2014): 170, n.85.

¹⁸¹ Pace Edward M. Cook, “4Q246,” *BBR* 5 (1995): 43-66. See Collins, “Son of God,” 51-62.

¹⁸² The considerable debate over whether the “son of God” figure is negative (e.g., Alexander Balas as per J. T. Milik) or positive is largely irrelevant here, although I concur with Collins’ judgment that the figure is messianic, since there is no condemnation of the figure, and the language has a positive messianic sense in the closely parallel passage in Luke 1.32-25. Collins, “Son of God,” 58-61. Since “son of God” is not used elsewhere in the DSS of an angel figure, Martínez’ suggestion to that effect here is less likely. Florentino García Martínez, “The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*, ed. Florentino García Martínez (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 162-179. However, noteworthy is Ferda’s argument for a positive figure here based on the fact that “naming” is used in the wider biblical naming tradition exclusively of positive figures. Ferda, “Naming the Messiah,” 150-175.

similar point: “...and was determined to be Son of God with power” (Rom 1.4).¹⁸³ The Synoptic tradition of the theophanic voice declaring Jesus as the Son “in whom I am pleased” identifies him with the Servant figure of Isaiah 42, who is called and named in Isaiah 49. As with the Name-keeping, John’s Name-giving echoes this broader naming tradition in its authorizing function.

Isaiah

Although the Name in John 17.11-12 functions similarly to some traditions surveyed here—notably the OT naming tradition and Name Angel traditions—it is here proposed that, within the OT, Isaiah in particular was the primary impetus for John’s interest in the divine Name category as reflected in John 17.11-12. Two points establishing the plausibility of this proposal have already been argued—that John was clearly familiar with and dependent upon several passages in Isaiah, and that the divine Name concept in both GJohn and Isaiah is both eschatological and associative in *significance*. In what follows, this proposal will be strengthened by three sets of general indications that Isaiah was the catalyst for the use of divine Name language in 17.11-12.

First, there are at least two general patterns of correspondence between certain passages in Isaiah and the Name-keeping and Name-giving of John 17. The Isaianic expressions in which name language functions to identify the people of God are echoed by similar expressions in GJohn, which may be seen clearly in chart form:

Isaiah	GJohn
People will know the Name (Isa 52.6)	Believers are given to know the Name (17.6)
People will invoke the Name (Isa 48.1; 64.6[7]; 65.1)	Believers consequently enter an era of invoking the Father through Jesus’ newly minted name (16.24)
People will be identified with God/his Name (Isa 41.25; 43.7; 44.5; 65.15)	Believers are kept in the Name (17.11-12)
People are given a “new name” which is likely God’s own Name (Isa 56.5; 62.2; 65.15)	Jesus is given the divine Name (17.11-12)

Since the function of name language in Isaiah is, in part, to identify the people of God, and since John is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah for his Name-revelation concept (see chapter 2), name language in Isaiah may similarly have contributed to the Name-keeping expression. In this

¹⁸³ Ferda goes too far in his suggestion that these and other NT passages represent a “sustained attempt to link Jesus to a preexisting messianic framework.” The naming tradition outlined above is not exclusively or even usually “messianic.” Ferda, “Naming the Messiah,” 174.

context, perhaps John regarded Nathanael as representative of this newly identified people. Scholars have noted that Nathanael, the “true Israelite” (1.47), is implicitly contrasted with the “Jews” who express idolatrous fidelity to Caesar (19.15).¹⁸⁴ This is reminiscent of the contrast in Isaiah 44.1-20 between idolaters and those who bear the name “Israel” and who are “of God.”¹⁸⁵ And if Nathanael’s identity as a “true Israelite” is intended to evoke Jacob, who also appears in the context (Gen 32.29-30; John 1.51), then perhaps, like Jacob, this identity is implicitly contingent upon a vision of the one whose Name is divinely revealed. The “greater things” Nathanael will see (1.51) culminate in what Jesus will summarize as the disclosure of the divine Name (17.6).

Similarly, the distinction in John 17 between believers “kept” in the Name and the Son who is given the Name bears some resemblance to a dual-emphasis drawn out by later interpreters of Isaiah: On the one hand, the Servant is named (Isa 49.1), and his name implicitly identified with the divine Name, while on the other, God’s people bear his Name (Isa 43.1, 5-7; 44.5).¹⁸⁶ Furthermore, the Servant’s name is identified implicitly with the divine Name borne by the eschatological people of God: They trust in the divine Name (Isa 50.10) and hope in the Servant’s name (Isa 42.4); and there are indications that the “new name” by which the remnant are called (Isa 65.15) might be the eschatologically revealed divine Name, with which the Servant is intimately bound up (Isa 52.6-10; 53.1).¹⁸⁷ In other words, the fact that the Servant was closely identified with the divine Name becomes constitutive of the divine Name that identifies the faithful community. This is not unlike John 17, where believers are kept in a fundamentally shared Name.

Second, there are some indications from the wider Johannine corpus that Isaianic passages featuring name language were not only familiar, but also significant to the communit(ies) in which the Gospel was produced. The inscribing of believers in Revelation with a “new name”—a “secret” name (Rev 2.17) or Jesus’ own “new name” (Rev 3.12)—echoes passages in Isaiah, such as 62.2: “he *will call you* by your new name” (also Isa 56.5; 65.15).¹⁸⁸ In addition, the

¹⁸⁴ See Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment*, 99.

¹⁸⁵ Brown, I: 87; Idem., II: 894-895.

¹⁸⁶ See discussion in chapter 1. A similar idea appears in Qumran: “in the true interpretation of his name are their names...” (CD-A col II.12-13). My translation.

¹⁸⁷ See discussion of the “new name” in Isaiah in chapter 1.

¹⁸⁸ Beale argues at length that Isaiah 65.15-16 forms the primary background for Revelation 3.12-14. G. K. Beale, “The Old Testament Background of Rev 3.14,” *NTS* 42 (1996): 141-142. Similarly, Jesus’ secret name (Rev 19.12) derives from Isaiah 62.2. G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999),

dual-association in Isaiah of both the Servant and believers with the divine Name noted above may well be reflected in Revelation: Jesus' new name (Rev 3.12; 19.12) in turn identifies the faithful (Rev 3.12; cf. 2.17; 14.1; 22.4). Furthermore, as in Isaiah 56.5 and 65.15, so in Revelation, the "new name" is a promise intended to comfort the faithful people of God.

Third, there are indications that this wider communit(ies) read name language in Isaiah as an associative concept. Earlier it was observed that believers bear the names of both the Father and Jesus (Rev 3.12; 14.1). Rather than indicating two distinct names, this likely reflects the conviction that a single divine Name is shared by the two figures. This is in keeping with the seer's application elsewhere of Isaiah's divine titles to Jesus, such as "first and last," "Amen," and "faithful and true."¹⁸⁹ If the Greek translation of YHWH known to him was ΙΑΩ,¹⁹⁰ then such hermeneutical moves may have resulted from his reflection on the letters of ΙΑΩ. Lincicum proposes that the name contains the alphabetical merism ΑΩ, which is of particular significance to the seer, and which he may have associated with the Isaianic title "first and last" (Rev 22.13; cf. 21.6).¹⁹¹ The remaining initial *iota* may then have been regarded as a hidden reference to Jesus' name.¹⁹² This could reflect his conviction that the divine Name in Isaiah is actually shared by God and Jesus.

The author of 1 John may likewise have read name language in Isaiah as associative. There is a striking parallel between 1 John 2.12, "sins are forgiven you because of his [i.e., Jesus'] name" and the Targum of Isaiah 43.25 "forgiveness on account of my [i.e., God's] name," which may indicate that the Elder was alluding to a version of Isaiah 43.25 similar to that reflected in the

954. See also G. K. Beale and Sean M. McDonough, "Revelation," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 1094-1095, 1097-1098.

¹⁸⁹ Bauckham argues the title "first...last" is drawn from Isaiah 44.6 (cf. 41.4; 48.12). Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 58. Similarly Beale, "Rev 3.14," 138-142.

¹⁹⁰ See Introduction, n.32.

¹⁹¹ In some Amoraic texts, the divine "seal" is "Truth" (אמת), because it contains the first, middle, and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and therefore corresponds to Isaiah 44.6: "I am the first and last..." (e.g., Midr. Gen 81.2). Perhaps inspired similarly by Isaiah 44.6, John has translated this idea into Greek, presenting God with the name "Alpha and Omega" (Rev 1.8; 22.13).

¹⁹² David Lincicum, "The Origin of 'Alpha and Omega' (Revelation 1.8; 21.6; 22.13): A Suggestion," *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 132-133. Attaching such significance to the *iota* occurs elsewhere in early Christian tradition (see, e.g., Barn. 9.8). Ford makes a parallel suggestion that the author adapted the Exodus title "...the one who will be" to ὁ ἐρχόμενος—an early Christian title for Jesus—to reflect the conviction that Jesus had been included in the divine Name. J. Ford " 'He that Cometh' and the Divine Name (Apocalypse 1.4, 8; 4.8)," *JSJ* 1 (1970): 144-147.

Targum.¹⁹³ If so, he has effortlessly replaced God's Name with Jesus' name. Although such a move may reflect a basic christological hermeneutic, it could also signal an understanding that the divine Name category in particular was shared between God and his Servant, between Father and Son. It is plausible that the same set of passages from Isaiah generated the eschatological and associative significance of the divine Name in John 17.11-12.

Conclusion

In the preceding chapter, the significance of the divine Name as it occurs in John 17.11-12 has been distinguished from its meaning and function. The idea of Name-giving may well have been suggested to John by prior Christian tradition, and further facilitated by Jewish naming tradition featuring a single individual, or Name Angel traditions, where the Name functions to authorize angelic figures. Similarly, the references to keeping believers in the Name (17.11-12) may draw on Christian liturgical traditions, the Name-sealing tradition, or more broadly on OT passages in which Name functions to identify the people of God.

However, the clue to the impetus behind John's interest in the divine Name category lies in the eschatological and associative significance of the Name in 17.11-12. John's conviction that Jesus embodies the eschatological revelation of the divine Name he shares with the Father derives in particular from certain passages in Isaiah, upon which John was demonstrably dependent, and in which the divine Name is similarly eschatological and associative in significance. Moreover, there are indications that Isaiah's divine Name concept was of particular significance in wider Johannine material. Taken together, these observations comprise a case for the plausibility of the proposal that, although the formulations featuring the divine Name in John 17.11-12 were likely influenced by several texts and traditions, the primary generative force behind them was the conviction that Jesus embodies the eschatological manifestation of the divine Name in Isaiah; and consequently the followers of Jesus are the eschatological people of God who would bear or be called by the divine Name.

As will be explored in the Conclusion, a Gospel that could lay claim to such seminal passages in Isaiah would invariably carry significant weight in the polemically charged and pastorally vulnerable period of the late first century. The reverence to be accorded Jesus (John 5.23) is grounded in the fact that he has embodied the salvific eschatological activity of God

¹⁹³ Ronning, "The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature," 247-251.

proclaimed in the sacred texts of Israel. It is John's conviction about the significance of the *event* of Jesus, not his metaphysical or mystical speculation about the *identity* of Jesus or of the divine Name, which grounds and generates his Gospel.

Chapter 4: “In my Father’s Name”

Introduction

As noted in the Introduction, John reformulated the agency expression “in the Name” from Psalm 117[118].26 twice in his Gospel—in 5.43 and 10.25. This indicates both that John was attracted to the expression and that he had adopted it into his own thinking. Perhaps the increased significance of the expression was the consequence of a post-resurrection interpretive situation (12.16; cf. 7.39; 2.22). It is also interesting that these reformulations constitute part of Jesus’ defense in the juridical discourses of chapters 5 and 10, which bracket John’s controversy section (5.1-10.39).¹ What was the impetus for John’s interest in this expression? As in chapters 2 and 3, the aim here is to distinguish the meaning, function, and significance of the Name as it occurs in these reformulations, and consequently explore the question of impetus.² It will be argued that John’s unique attention to this expression reflects his interest in the divine Name in particular, and represents his conviction, likely generated by Isaiah, that the divine Name is associative and eschatological in significance.

John 5.43

Having healed a paralytic on the Sabbath (5.1-9), Jesus is charged with Sabbath-breaking (5.10-16). When he responds that he does only what the Father does, he is accused of claiming equality with God (5.18),³ which amounts to a charge of blasphemy.⁴ The central issue, then, regards what

¹ All the disputes in GJohn occur here, punctuated by attempts to arrest or kill Jesus (5.16, 18; 7.19, 20, 25, 32, 44; 8.20, 59; 10.31-33, 39), and by charges (implicit or explicit) of blasphemy (5.16-18; 8.58-59; 10.33).

² This chapter will not deal with the citation of Psalm 117[118].26 in 12.13, which John has largely adopted from the Synoptic tradition, since that which is most distinctive to his thought is more likely to be evident in the reformulations. So Schnackenburg: “...neither in ‘he who comes’ (cf. 1.15, 27; 3.31; 6.14; 11.27) or in ‘in the name’ (cf. 5.43; 10.25; 17.11-12) will he have added his own theology.” Schnackenburg, II: 375. This does not detract from the fact that “12.13b kann nicht unabhängig von der joh. Christologie verstanden werden.” Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 44.

³ A surface reading suggests that Jesus is accused simply because he calls God “Father.” However, this was a common enough address for God in Jewish circles. Rather, the Jews correctly perceive in Jesus’ action and speech a claim to a particular kind of familial relation (πατέρα ἰδίον) by which he can so profoundly associate his own action with that of the Father. Bultmann, 244, n.7; Lindars, 219; Keener, I: 646-647. Pace McGrath, who takes “making” (ποιέω) as a concessive participle, rendering the two clauses here as contrasting: “he was calling God his own Father, although (or possibly “while”) he was making himself equal with God.” McGrath, *John’s Apologetic Christology*, 88.

constitutes fidelity to the Father. In his longer response (5.19-47),⁵ Jesus does not deny his equality with the Father. He has not made *himself* equal, but he has been given the divine prerogative of judgment over life and death (5.23, 27, 30).⁶ This means, both that Jesus' power and authority is derivative from the Father,⁷ and that his action is actually a display of divine action (cf. 14.10). Jesus' response constitutes a defense of his fidelity to the Father, as well as a self-disclosure⁸ and a countering accusation: The Father has made *Jesus* the measure or index of fidelity to God, and therefore opposition to him constitutes opposition to God.⁹ There is a sense in which much of this is summarized in the claim at the conclusion of Jesus' defense: "I have come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me" (5.43).¹⁰

⁴ The similarity of reaction (seeking to kill Jesus) in 5.18 and 8.59, where blasphemy is explicit suggests that John regarded the issues in chapter 5 and 8 as fundamentally related. Truex has argued that, in early Judaism, blasphemy included "verbal or non-verbal public displays intended to discredit, disparage, or dishonour God and, by association, similar attacks on God's Temple, or God's chosen leader...." Jerry Duane Truex, "The Problem of Blasphemy: The Fourth Gospel and Early Jewish Understandings" (Ph.D. Thesis, Durham, 2001), 187. The Jews in John 5 regard Jesus' words and actions as a threat to the uniqueness of God, and therefore as blasphemous. Jesus' clarification of "equality" in 5.19-30 "would have been heard as audacious blasphemy by non-believing Jews." Ibid., 225.

⁵ Most scholars divide John 5 at verses 18-19. Some see two major sections (healing in vv.1-18, and discourse in vv.19-47). Barrett, 249-257; Lindars, 209-227; Bultmann, 240-247. Others further subdivide the "healing" into two sections: the healing (vv.1-9a) and dialogue (vv.9b-18). Dodd, *Interpretation*, 320; Beasley-Murray, 73-77. However, most scholars divide Jesus' defense into two sections (vv.19-30, 31-47). Schnackenburg is unusual in that he recognizes this break, but groups the first half of Jesus' discourse in with the narrative that precedes: "healing" (vv.1-15), persecution and the power of the son of man (vv.16-30) and divine testimony to Jesus' credibility (vv.31-47). Schnackenburg, II: 91.

⁶ God alone gives life (e.g., Isa 40.26) and rules (e.g., Dan 4.34-35). So, as Dodd puts it, Jesus' words "seem to imply collateral action with God in a field where God's competence is exclusive." Dodd, *Interpretation*, 326; cf. 323-324. Also Bauckham, "God Crucified," 8-9.

⁷ Jesus' power to raise the dead, for instance, is dependent on the Father who "hears" Jesus' petition before he raises Lazarus (11.42). Wendy North represents many scholars who regard the Lazarus narrative as having been deliberately conformed to the "eschatological scenario" of 5.24-29. Wendy S. North, *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 96-101.

⁸ There is a sense in which Jesus' defense answers the question posed to the paralytic by the Jews: "Who is the man who said to you...?" (5.12).

⁹ Honouring the Father means honouring the Son (5.23). Similarly, "believing" the Father and a concern for his glory are measured in terms of believing "the one whom the Father sent" (5.38, 44). Conversely, the proof that Jesus' opponents do not have God's "word" or "love" in them (5.38, 42) is that (ὅτι) they disbelieve Jesus (5.38). The ὅτι clause can function as a logical ground ("because") or an evidential ground ("which is shown by the fact that"). Although Barrett suggests both options are present (Barrett, 267), the latter is to be preferred here. It is not so much that their lack of belief in Jesus *results* in their lacking the word of God, but rather it is *indicative* of that fact.

¹⁰ There may also be a sense in which verse 43 itself functions here as something of a mission statement, not unlike 17.6. In the Synoptics, the "I have come" sayings that appear with a purpose statement (e.g., Mk 2.17 and para.) garner significant attention because they summarize Jesus' entire mission. John

Meaning

As a reformulation of ὀνόματι κυρίου in 12.13, John's ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου still derives its significance from the implicit referent, κύριος.¹¹ This is entirely appropriate in the context of a blasphemy charge in which fidelity to God is at issue. However, distinguishable from the referent is the *meaning* of the Name within the expression. Untergassmair has argued rightly that the expression “in my Father’s name” characterizes Jesus’ coming.¹² The claim, “I have come in my Father’s Name,” invites the reader to recall the statements Jesus has made about his mission and authorization. Since “coming” and “sending” language are inextricably linked in GJohn, Jesus’ coming (v43) recalls the sending language from earlier in the passage (5.23-24, 30, 36-38).¹³ In this context, some suggest that the Name simply means *mission*: “I have come in/on the Father’s mission.”¹⁴ However, the works accomplished by Jesus (5.36) reveal that he has been granted divine prerogatives and made the measure of fidelity to the Father (5.23). They are characterized later as works done “in my Father’s name” (10.25) because they are actually works of the Father (5.17; cf. 14.10). Thus, in Jesus’ “coming,” the very action of the Father himself is revealed, and coming “in my Father’s name” means to come revealing the Father.

In this context, the Name itself means, on the one hand, something of the Father himself. John’s use of the same language in chapter 14, where the Paraclete is sent in Jesus’ name, indicates that the name communicates something of the sending figure: The juxtaposition of the promise of the Paraclete’s coming (14.22) and of Jesus’ own coming (14.18, 28) suggests some relationship between the two (although one need not exhaust the other). It is precisely because the Paraclete is sent in Jesus’ name that he can, in some measure, embody his presence. Likewise, Jesus communicates something of the Father himself by coming in his Name. In the context of chapter

does not have any such statements, and nearly all of Jesus’ “I have come” sayings are followed by locative prepositional phrases, not infinitives of purpose: I have come “from heaven” (6.38, 42), “into the/world” (9.39; 12.46; 16.28; 18.37), “from God” (8.42) or “from the Father” (16.28), “not from myself” (7.28; 8.42). John 5.43 is unique in that it characterizes the manner of Jesus’ coming (“in my Father’s Name”).

¹¹ The anarthrous κύριος in the closely related expression τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου (1.23) would likely have been taken as a proper name—the Greek rendering of YHWH—since an anarthrous noun cannot be governed by an articular noun (cf. similar construction in Acts 2.20; 5.9; 2 Cor 3.17-18). See Davis, *Name and Way*, 90-93; cf. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 115.

¹² Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 49.

¹³ See chapter 3, n.24.

¹⁴ E.g., Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg*, 148. Heitmüller recognizes, however, that this is not straightforward. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 53, 86.

5, this “something,” signified by the Name, is the divine prerogatives, the exercise of which are granted the Son.¹⁵ Jesus’ exercise of the divine prerogative of life-giving in raising Lazarus elicits the crowd’s acclamation of Jesus as the one who comes “in the name of the Lord” (12.9-11, 17-18).¹⁶ It is unlikely coincidental that the reformulation of this phrase occurs in the context of Jesus’ claim to have authority to give life (5.25-29). Indeed, John may well have been familiar with the identification of the divine prerogatives of life-giving and rule/judgment with the divine names YHWH and Elohim, reflected in rabbinic tradition and in Philo.¹⁷ Thus, there is a sense in which coming in the Name means to come *revealing* the Name, i.e., divine prerogatives.

On the other hand, in the immediate context of 5.43-44, the Name is closely identified with Jesus himself. Two sets of statements mutually interpret one another:

- a: ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε με·
b: ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήμψεσθε.
c: πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι
b': δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες,
a': καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ¹⁸ οὐ ζητεῖτε;

In these verses, Jesus draws at least four comparisons:

1. Jesus’ coming “in my Father’s name” (a) is contrasted with “another” who comes “in his own name” (b)
2. “receiving glory from one another” (b') is contrasted with “seeking the glory which is from the only God” (a')
3. *receiving* “another” who comes “in his own name” (b) corresponds to “receiving glory from one another” (b')
4. “receiving me [Jesus]” (a) is linked directly to “seeking the glory which comes from the only God” (a')

¹⁵ Here I diverge slightly from Untergassmair, who does not distinguish the meaning of the Name within the expression from the expression as a whole. He argues instead that the “Name” means the revelatory works. Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 55.

¹⁶ Cf. n.7. Note, however, that there is some confusion of crowds in John 12. “Many (Πολλοί) of the Jews” who saw the raising of Lazarus and believed in Jesus (11.45) appear in 12.17 as a “crowd (ὁ ὄχλος).” This crowd is distinguished from the “many (πολλοί) Jews” (11.55-56) or “great crowd (ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς)” of Festival-goers (12.12), who go out to meet him (12.13, 18) and acclaim him in the words of Psalm 117[118]. The “great crowd” looking for Jesus in 12.9 could be either, or indeed a third group. See Brown, I: 456.

¹⁷ See chapter 2, n.87. Jerome Neyrey, “‘Equal to God,’ (John 5.18),” in *The Gospel in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 180-190. Similarly Segal, *Two Powers*, 216.

¹⁸ θεοῦ is omitted in several key manuscripts, including P66 P75 B and W. Yet, this may be attributed to a transcriptional oversight (ΘΥ contraction omitted from TOYMONOYΘΥOY). It is less likely that θεοῦ was added later, since it fits the context, as well as John’s language elsewhere (e.g., 17.3).

From this, it may be inferred that Jesus is profoundly identified with divine glory and so also with the divine Name. Seeking glory from (παρά) God is identified with accepting Jesus, who himself comes from the Father. Readers know that glory from God is shared with Jesus (17.5); and it is the glory of “the only begotten,” who himself is “from the Father (παρά πατρός)” (1.14; cf. 6.46; 9.33; 16.27-28). The glory from the Father is not divine approval, but the glory embodied in Jesus himself. Yet divine glory is clearly paralleled here with the divine Name as well, as is the case throughout GJohn.¹⁹ Consequently, rejecting Jesus amounts to rejecting the glory and Name of God. Thus the Name itself means the prerogatives of the Father on the one hand, and on the other, is bound up with the Son.

Function

It is interesting that the “in the Name” expressions in both 5.43 and 10.25 appear as part of Jesus’ defense in the two controversies—both featuring blasphemy charges (5.19-45; 10.22-39; cf. 8.58-59; 19.7)—which bracket the controversy section of GJohn (5.1-10.39). The conflict generated in chapter 5 over Sabbath-keeping is resumed by the second Sabbath conflict in chapter 9, and reaches a climax in Jesus’ radical claim to oneness with the Father (10.30). In both controversies, the expression functions to identify Jesus as a divinely authorized agent, and aptly captures the stress Jesus lays on both his subordination to the Father, and his exalted status from the Father. Within this agency expression, the Name functions to legitimate Jesus. Since the Name means the divine prerogatives disclosed by Jesus’ “greater” revelatory works, which “testify” to Jesus, the Name functions as the testimony to *Jesus*. Moreover, since the Name signals Jesus’ exercise of *divine* prerogatives, it legitimates his role as the index of honouring *the Father* (5.23).

Closely related to this, the Name functions to authorize Jesus for the works he is sent to accomplish. In 5.37, Jesus claims that the Father has “testified” (μεμαρτύρηκεν) to him. The past perfective verb here indicates a completed action, which should be distinguished from the ongoing witness of the Father (ὁ μαρτυρῶν, μαρτυρεῖ) in 5.32 through the “works” and possibly also the “Scriptures.”²⁰ As discussed in chapter 3,²¹ this completed action is bound up with the sealing

¹⁹ Both are “given” to the Son (17.11, 23) and manifested by him (17.4-6); and both concepts seem to be applied equally to both Father and Son (compare 12.23, 28; 13.31-32; 17.1), and identified with the climax of his mission (12.28; 17.6, 26).

²⁰ *Pace* Dodd who identifies the past perfective testimony of verse 37 with the works and Scriptures of verses 36 and 39. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 329. Likewise, Keener, I: 678; Martin Asiedu-Peprah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts as Juridical Controversy* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 105. If there is a

(6.27) and Name-giving (17.11-12), which function to undergird Jesus' mission of Name-revelation. Also, the "works" are part of the "work" by which Jesus reveals the Name (17.6).²² These links between Jesus' defense here and the divine Name elsewhere may have encouraged readers to highlight the Name as it occurs in the more immediate context (5.43).²³ The Father testifies to and authorizes Jesus by giving him the Name in which he comes. And the Name in which he comes authorizes Jesus to exercise divine prerogatives in the "works" which culminate in his mission of Name-revelation.

Significance

In the context of a charge of blasphemy, John was drawn to the highest category available to him—the divine Name. Yet, in his presentation of Jesus as the index of fidelity to God, he was greatly aided by the conviction that the divine Name itself signified the association of Father and Son. Within the phrase "I have come in my Father's name," the divine Name itself is the aspect that represents the profound association of Father and Son. The Name means the divine prerogatives, and is also bound up with the Son himself. Furthermore, the Name functions to authorize Jesus for the exercise of these prerogatives and to legitimate Jesus in his role as the index of fidelity to the Father. Together, these points indicate that John regarded the Name category itself as fundamentally associative. Two observations reinforce this point.

First, the claim of 5.43 is reminiscent of 1.11-12:²⁴

5.43: ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε με·

1.11-12: εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν...τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

The verbal links between these two passages (ἔρχομαι, [παρα]λαμβάνω, ὄνομα) are reinforced by the fact that the controversy of John 5 represents the first significant instance of the rejection forecast by 1.11-12: "Therefore the Jews persecuted Jesus" (5.16). John prepares his readers for this instance of rejection with the aside in 4.44: "Jesus himself had testified that, in his own (τῇ ἰδίᾳ)

relationship between the completed testimony and Jesus' works, it is in the *completed* action of the Father in *already having given* to his Son to do these works. So Schnackenburg, II: 38, 121, 124, 126; Thyen, 323.

²¹ See chapter 3, n.10.

²² See chapter 2, n.26.

²³ John does something similar with the "I am" sayings: The dramatic responses of characters to Jesus' later "I am" sayings (8.58-59; 18.6) push readers to re-read earlier sayings with greater significance (e.g., 4.26). See Ball, *I Am*, 142-144, 149-150.

²⁴ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 172.

land, a prophet has no honour.”²⁵ Although the expressions are not exactly parallel,²⁶ John was fond of repeating themes with variations that encourage reflection. Thus the juxtaposition of these passages encouraged by thematic and linguistic similarity throws into sharp relief a striking variation: In 1.12, receiving Jesus is identified with believing in *Jesus’* name, but in 5.43 it is receiving the one who comes “in my *Father’s* name.” This change of names implies a profound relationship between the figures represented by these names. Somehow coming in the *Father’s* Name forms the basis for belief in *Jesus’* name.

Second, the narratives of John 4—5 create ambiguity between the names of Jesus and the Father, which could indicate an associative significance inherent in John’s Name concept. In 4.10, Jesus makes an apparently casual comment to the Samaritan woman, which turns out to be deeply significant: εἰ ᾔδεις...τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι. John’s readers know that the woman is speaking with the *Logos* identified “with God” in the beginning (1.2), and so of course is “greater than our ancestor Jacob” (4.12). Jesus’ comment thus contributes to the irony in the dialogue which is only resolved by the climactic self-revelation: ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι (4.26). This prepares John’s readers to recognize an extra level of significance in a similarly phrased comment by the Jews to the paralytic in 5.12: τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ εἰπὼν σοι.²⁷ Just as Jesus’ discourse with the woman and ultimately his self-revelation “I am” (4.26) fills out and answers the “who” (τίς) of 4.10, so Jesus’ defense in John 5 answers the question τίς of 5.12.

The question invites response in the form of a *name*. Of course at one level, the answer is simply “Jesus,” who healed the man. However, Jesus’ works, including his Sabbath action, manifest the action of the Father, who also is working “up to now” (5.17). So at another level, the

²⁵ Unlike the Synoptics, Jesus’ “own country” is Judea, not Galilee, where, by contrast, he is received (4.45). The move from Judea to Galilee (4.3, 44-45) echoes the move from “his own” to “as many as received him” (1.12). For John, Jerusalem and Judea is the center of the world and of decision. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 39-40.

²⁶ Whereas ὄνομα is the *object* or *goal* in 1.12, having a locative sense with εἰς, it characterizes Jesus’ coming in 5.43, where the ἐν phrase accents its function. Merlier, “Onoma,” 187-188. Bratcher’s similar point is weakened by his reductionist reading that 5.43 indicates representation. Bratcher, “The Name,” 72-80. Note also that, as εἰς and ἐν had become almost interchangeable by John’s day, the phrases were likely heard as roughly analogous. See New, “The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands,” 123, n.3.

²⁷ There are other “narrative echoes” or “patterns of recurrence” (see Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, 29) of John 4 in John 5 which encourage readers to connect the two narratives. As with the woman, Jesus miraculously knows the ailment of the paralytic (5.6; cf. 4.18). In both passages, Jesus diverts attention from physical water to himself (5.7; cf. 4.11-14). Note also the recurrence of similar phrases: “I do not have a husband (ἄνδρα)” (4.17) and “I do not have a man (ἄνθρωπον)” (5.7), and the repeated “hour is coming and now is” (4.23; 5.25). This pattern encourages us to attribute some of the ironic significance of the question in 4.10 to its echo in 5.12.

τίς is actually God.²⁸ As Marianne Thompson writes: “To name the one who did it, one would have to say ‘Jesus’—which implies, nevertheless, that God did it.”²⁹ There is a pregnant gap left by the question τίς, which invites readers to reflect on the relationship between the two possible answers. Jesus’ whole defense encourages readers to associate the two. Verse 43 in particular supplies readers with the ideal resolution to the tension between Jesus and the Father in the narrative. John has carefully deployed name language at this crucial juncture in the narrative precisely because it allows for association of the two figures.³⁰ Here, the τίς of 5.12 can be simultaneously God and Jesus because, as we observed earlier, the Name *means* that which is of the Father, and also entails Jesus himself. The gap left by the absence of God’s Name in response to the question τίς is supplied by the ὄνομα in 5.43, which signifies simultaneously the action and presence of God and the agency of his Son. Both these observations reinforce the inference that John regarded the Name as fundamentally associative.

In addition to this, the placement of the Name in the context of “coming” language may indicate the eschatological significance of the Name for John. For John, the “coming” of Jesus is to be identified with his role as messiah and king (1.27, 41, 49; 11.27; 12.13³¹), and “prophet” (6.14), as well as the one coming on the “way” promised in Isaiah 40.3-5 (1.15, 23, 27). This does not mean that John regarded these roles as synonymous.³² However, it does indicate that John’s “coming” language reflects eschatological expectation. This accords with the juxtaposition of Jesus’ own coming with the coming of the eschatological hour.³³ As Brunson notes, “[c]oming’ is the primary

²⁸ Brown misses the significance of this question when he notes simply that the leaders have “lost sight of” the healing and focus on the identity of the perpetrator. Brown, I: 208.

²⁹ Thompson, “God’s Voice,” 191.

³⁰ Docherty suggests that a name functions as a space-holder or “gap,” which the reader is encouraged to fill with meaning as furnished by the narrative. Cited in Thompson, “God’s Voice,” 189. Perhaps the name category itself functions similarly for John.

³¹ Although the coming one of Psalm 117[118].26 was nowhere clearly identified with the messiah, John accents the royal significance of the psalm with his added clarification “the king of Israel” (12.13). Schnackenburg, II: 375. And by the rabbinic period, the psalm had acquired messianic significance (see, e.g., Tg. Ps. 118.22-26; b. Pesah. 117b).

³² For instance, John never fully identifies “messiah” with “king.” They are paralleled in 1.41, 49. And Meeks suggests that Jesus’ trial as “king” is a “counterpart” to the question of the crowd: “Surely the [m]essiah does not come from Galilee does he?” (7.41). Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 61. However, as the titles are never explicitly juxtaposed, Meeks cautions: “...one may perhaps perceive a deliberate ambiguity, a certain reserve in the Johannine use of χριστός. In any case it cannot be assumed that the use of βασιλεύς automatically implies the background of the Davidic messianology.” Ibid., 89. Nevertheless, he does suggest that the meaning of “messiah” is found in the Johannine concept of kingship. Ibid., 81.

³³ Compare 4.23 and 4.26; 5.25 and 5.43; 12.13, 27 and 12.23.

catchword for messianic and other eschatological speculation.”³⁴ In this context, since the coming expression in 5.43 as a whole means the disclosure of divine prerogatives in Jesus, or indeed disclosure of the Name in which he comes (cf. 17.6), there may be a hint here that the disclosure of this Name is at the heart of eschatological expectation reflected in the “coming.”

John 10.25

John 10.22-39 brings to a climax the controversies which have preceded,³⁵ and it bears special resemblance to the first controversy in chapter 5. Both controversies are generated by charges of Sabbath-breaking (5.16; 9.16).³⁶ In both, Jesus points to his “works.”³⁷ And both feature the charge of blasphemy (5.18; 10.33), and occur in the shadow of the question of Jesus’ identity (5.12; 10.24). Furthermore, a second reformulation of the expression in Psalm 117[118].26 occurs in 10.25 (cf. 5.43): τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ. It will be unsurprising then to find that the Name within this expression shares the same meaning, function, and significance, as it has in 5.43.

³⁴ Brunson, *Psalm 118*, 252.

³⁵ John Painter, “Tradition, History, and Interpretation in John 10,” in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*, ed. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 53. More specifically, the discourse of John 10.22-39 marks the culmination of controversy surrounding Jesus’ identity which began in chapter 7, and which climaxes with a charge of blasphemy (10.30-33). See Dodd, *Interpretation*, 388-389; Barrett, 378.

³⁶ Most scholars are agreed that the Sabbath controversy of Jesus’ healing of the blind man in chapter 9 is indissolubly linked with the Shepherd Discourse in chapter 10, to which 10.22-39 forms a conclusion. This accounts for the polemical tone of the Discourse. See results of the SBL Johannine section papers of 1985-1986, which focused on John 10. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna, eds., *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 3. Although 10.22-39 is set apart by a change in season and Festival (v22), it forms “a kind of appendix or epilogue” to the episode of 9.1-10.21. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 356; similarly Brown, I: 390. Some scholars, following Bultmann (Bultmann, 358-360) believe 10.22-26 originally followed immediately after 9.41 because it carries forward the emphasis on the blindness of the “Jews.” See Turner, “The History of Religions Background of John 10,” 34-35. However, a displacement theory is not necessary to speak about the relationship between this passage and chapter 9. It is just as likely that John is simply returning here to a theme (rejection) and a group (the blind/deaf), which he left in 9.41.

³⁷ In John 5, Jesus is defending his works (5.17), whereas in 10.25, 37-38, he evokes his works as part of his defense.

Meaning

In response to the question regarding his identity (10.24), Jesus draws attention to his “works,” which “testify” to him. Thus, the subsequent characterization of the works as being done “in my Father’s name” must be understood in terms of testimony. The expression as a whole means the works are revelatory. Furthermore, the Name within the expression is bound up with the works which legitimate Jesus in some way.

For John, Jesus’ works (τὰ ἔργα) include revelatory signs and words, which are “from God” (10.32) and “given” to the Son (5.36).³⁸ These works are the *Father’s* works: They are *from*—ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς (10.32)—or *of* the Father: τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς μου (10.37; cf. 9.3). Jesus can do nothing by himself (5.19, 30), but the Father actually does the works in him (14.10). Thus, on the one hand, Jesus’ works disclose the action of the *Father*, and the “greater works” reflect his exercise of exclusively divine prerogatives. On the other hand, they “testify” to Jesus that he is sent from the Father (5.36); he is “from God.”³⁹ The works demonstrate that “the Father is in me” (10.38). An analogous dynamic is at work in John 14, where believers will do “greater works” because Jesus himself acts in and through his followers—accomplishing what they ask “in my name” (14.13) through the Paraclete, who comes in Jesus’ name, and so embodies his presence (14.16, 26).⁴⁰

In 10.25, this revelatory quality of the works is conveyed in the expression “in my Father’s name.” The works disclose the action of the Father, and that the Father is active in the Son.

Speaking of the Name, Untergassmair notes:

Der Bezug, der mit dieser Wendung zwischen Vater und Sohn bezeichnet wird, legt es nahe, in der Wendung ‘im Namen des Vaters’ einen Hinweis auf einen ‘Auftrag’ von seiten des Vaters zu sehen.⁴¹

Within the expression, the Name itself constitutes the heart of that which the works testify about Jesus, i.e., the divine prerogatives and action which Jesus exercises. It is because the works signal this divine quality that they “testify” to Jesus.

³⁸ Bultmann rightly subsumes the signs and words within the “works” which he suggests must refer to Jesus’ “revealing activity as a whole.” Bultmann, 390. Note, for instance, the “works” to which Jesus directs his disciples in 14.10 appear to be, not miracles, but “the words I say to you.” Contrast Barrett’s simplistic equation of “works” and “signs” with “miracles.” Barrett, 75.

³⁹ A primary issue in John 9 is the provenance of Jesus (see vv. 16, 29, 33; “Siloam” in verse 7 means “sent”).

⁴⁰ These works represent Jesus continuing assistance “in a new mode.” Ashton, *Understanding*, 444.

⁴¹ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 59.

Function

At one level, this expression identifies Jesus as God's authorized agent.⁴² He acts on authority from and on behalf of the Father. However, Jesus does not simply act as an agent on behalf of the Father, for the Father himself acts in and through Jesus (10.38; 14.10). And not only is the Father in Jesus, but Jesus is in the Father (10.38). Moreover, Jesus appeals to the works done in the Name to legitimate his claim to oneness with the Father. In response to the interrogation of verse 24,⁴³ Jesus responds with the claim: "the works that I do in my Father's name testify to me" (10.25), and he concludes with another claim: "I and the Father are one" (10.30). In contrast to the Jews, who regard these claims as unrelated (10.33), Jesus appeals to the works (10.32, 38), just characterized as done in the Name, to legitimate his claim to oneness.⁴⁴

It follows that the Name in particular, which characterizes these works, functions to legitimate Jesus' claim to oneness with the Father. It is not simply the works themselves, but that they are characterized by the divine Name, i.e., divine prerogatives, that grounds a claim to oneness with the Father and dispels the blasphemy charge. It is perhaps not incidental that the claims to "oneness" or mutual indwelling (10.30, 38) may well represent a Johannine reformulation of Jesus' claim "I am," which we noted earlier bears some relation to the divine Name concept for John. The scene bears resemblance to the Markan trial scene, in which Jesus'

⁴² Barrett, 380.

⁴³ Coloe helpfully outlines the two-part structure of the discourse:

Interrogation: "If you are the Messiah" (v24)

First Reply --witness of works (v35)
 --Jesus is shepherd and life-giver (vv.26-28)
 --the Father (v29)

Conclusion: "I and the Father are one" (v30)

Response: They took up stones (v31)

Accusation: "You make yourself God" (v32-33)

Second Reply --witness of Scripture (vv.34-35)
 --Jesus the consecrated and sent one (v36)
 --the Father (vv.37-38)

Conclusion: "The Father is in me and I am in the Father" (v38)

Response: They tried to arrest him (v39)

Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 147.

⁴⁴ For John, the language of mutual indwelling (10.38) is virtually synonymous with that of "oneness" (10.30).

climactic claim is “I am.”⁴⁵ And the parallel claim in 10.38 to mutual indwelling echoes Jesus’ “I am” declarations elsewhere:

ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε⁴⁶ ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ (10.38)
 τότε γνῶσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι (8.28).
 ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι (13.19)

Moreover, in 17.11-12, Jesus’ oneness with the Father may reflect that he is given the Name, and believers can be “one” precisely because they are kept “in your Name.”⁴⁷ Thus, within the agency expression “in my Father’s name,” the Name itself functions to undergird Jesus’ claim to oneness with the Father.

Significance

If the Name functions to legitimate Jesus’ claim to oneness with the Father, it could be that John’s oneness concept may, conversely, shed light on the significance of the divine Name for John. Some commentators argue that the “oneness” language (10.30) represents simply a “functional unity” between Father and Son. Jesus is “one” with the Father only in the sense that he is united in will or action with the Father.⁴⁸ However, there are other hints in the passage that “oneness” signals more than this. First, the language of mutual indwelling, which expounds the oneness claim (10.38), is difficult to understand in terms of mere unity of will or action.

⁴⁵ The entire passage (10.22-38) likely represents John’s rendition of the tradition reflected similarly in Mark’s trial scene. Within this, the statement ἐγὼ εἰμι of the Markan Jesus, which leads to the blasphemy charge, corresponds in function to Jesus’ claim in 10.30: “I and the Father are one.” Some think John draws on a synoptic-like but independent tradition here. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 91-92. But it may be simpler to say John knew and adapted Mark (and perhaps also Luke). Barrett, 380. Moody-Smith, *John among the Gospels*, 216. Sabbe argues that John 10.22-39 is indebted primarily to Luke’s account (Lk 22.63-71). M. Sabbe, “John 10 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels,” in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*, ed. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 75-93. Similarly Lincoln, *Truth*, 309-315.

⁴⁶ The NA²⁸ text of γινώσκητε is well attested (P45 P66 P75 B L Θ [W X γινώσχετε]), and most likely original. The strongly attested variant πιστεύσητε (A K Δ Π Ψ [X πιστεύητε]), may represent a copyists attempt to vary the diction. If so, it may represent his reading of 10.38 in conjunction with 13.19 (cf. Isa 43.10).

⁴⁷ Shirbroun, “Giving,” 282. McPolin, “The Name,” 99.

⁴⁸ Brown refers to it as a “unity of power and operation.” Brown, I: 407. William R. Loader, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), 164.

Second, Jesus does not attempt directly to correct the charge that he was making himself “God” (10.33).⁴⁹ He does not deny the designation “god” (10.34-36), but rather the accusation that he made *himself* God (10.33). The implication is that the Father has granted Jesus a status which would warrant the charge of blasphemy, had Jesus merely claimed it of himself.

Third, there are some indications that, in his oneness language, John intends to locate Jesus within the *Shema*—“Hear Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord” (Deut 6.4)—as the locus of Israel’s covenant fidelity. John is likely to have been drawn to the *Shema*, since this expression of God’s uniqueness was foundational to Jewish identity, and prized as the central conviction of an emerging Jewish monotheism.⁵⁰ And although he does not cite Deuteronomy 6.4,⁵¹ he is deeply concerned with issues related to it. Both Jesus and his opponents share a conviction in the singularity (ἕνα) of God (8.41)⁵² and his utter uniqueness: τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ (5.44),⁵³ or τὸν μόνον

⁴⁹ But note the anarthrous θεόν. The P66* variant which adds the article τὸν represents an attempt to clarify or strengthen the charge as Jesus making himself God (i.e., the one God).

⁵⁰ The evidence for liturgical use of the *Shema* in the first century is limited. See Paul Foster, “Why Did Matthew Get the Shema Wrong? A Study of Matthew 22.37,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 327. However, such a lack is unsurprising, since the *Shema* was commended, not for public liturgy, but for private familial use (Deut 6.1-10). See Andrew J. Byers “Johannine Theosis: The Fourth Gospel’s Narrative Ecclesiology of Participation and Deification” (Ph.D. Thesis, Durham University, 2014), chapter 5. Moreover, rabbinical references to daily *Shema* recital (m. Ber. 1-4; b. Ber. 61b) may record a practice that dated back to the first century. This is supported by the Nash Papyrus (which refers to the practice of reciting *Shema* after the Decalogue), dated to the first century AD by F. C. Burkitt. Burkitt surmised that this Papyrus represents “the daily worship of a pious Egyptian Jew who lived before the custom came to an end.” F. C. Burkitt, “The Hebrew Papyrus of the Ten Commandments,” *JQR* 15 (1903): 399. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 3.91; 4.212-213; 5.112. Aris. Ex. 132, 160. 1 QS 10.10. For further evidence that *Shema* recital was practiced in the first century, see David Instone-Brewer, *Prayer and Agriculture*, vol. 1 of *Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 43-52. Certainly by the rabbinic period, the *Shema* was established as a confession of orthodoxy. Segal, *Two Powers*, 137-141, 153. Dunn notes the “oneness of God” was the “primary axiom of Judaism” J. D. G. Dunn, “Let John Be John,” 333. Similarly, Bauckham, “God Crucified,” 5. N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 619-633. Furthermore, the attraction of several early Christian writers to the *Shema* indicates both its appeal and importance (Matt 19:16-17; 22:34-40; 23:8-10; Lk 10:25-28; 18:19; Rom 3:30; 1 Cor 8.6; Gal 3:20; 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 2:11; Jas 2:19; 4:12). See discussions in Birger Gerhardsson, *The Shema in the New Testament: Deut 6.4-5 in Significant Passages* (Lund: Novapress, 1996). Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 661-670. Bauckham, “God Crucified,” 27-30. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*, 97.

⁵¹ Some treatments focused on the *Shema* pass quickly over GJohn. E.g., Gerhardsson, *The Shema in the New Testament*, 315. Kim Huat Tan, “The Shema and Early Christianity,” *TynBull* 59 (2008): 200, n. 83. Perry B. Yoder, ed., *Take This Word to Heart: The Shema in Torah and Gospel* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 2005). However, John, who prefers to evoke rather than cite the OT, is unlikely to have been explicit in his use of Deuteronomy.

⁵² Beutler links this to the *Shema*. Johannes Beutler, “Das Hauptgebot im Johannesevangelium,” in *Das Gesetz im neuen Testament*, ed. Karl Kertelge (Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 236.

ἀληθινὸν θεόν (17.3). John seems to regard Jesus as the ideal keeper of *Shema*, zealously opposing that which threatens the uniqueness of God (2.17),⁵⁴ and willingly laying down his life as an expression of whole-hearted love for God (10.17-18).⁵⁵ More strikingly, John presents Jesus as the index of *Shema* fidelity in 5.42-44. Jesus links the failure of his opponents to seek glory from “the only God” (5.44)⁵⁶ with the fact that they do not have “the love of God”⁵⁷ or his “word” in them (5.38, 42). This echoes the pattern in Deuteronomy 6.4-5, where *Shema* fidelity is expressed in two ways: “You will love the Lord your God” and “these words” will be in their hearts.⁵⁸ Yet, the indication that these *Shema* conditions have not been met is the rejection of Jesus (5.38, 42-43). Similarly, rather than exhort his disciples to “love the Lord your God” and “keep [his] words,” Jesus says: “They who have *my* commandments and keep them are those who love *me*” (14.21).⁵⁹ In

⁵³ Several scholars see the *Shema* underlying 5.44: Friedrich Büchsel, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937), 80. Lori Baron, “Reinterpreting the Shema: The Battle over the Unity of God in the Fourth Gospel,” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL; Boston, MA, November 2008). Alicia D. Myers, *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 103. Jörg Augenstein, *Das Liebesgebot im Johannesevangelium und in den Johannesbriefen* (Berlin: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1994), 60-62. Josef Blank, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1981), 52, n. 8. Beutler, “Das Hauptgebot,” 229-231.

⁵⁴ “Zeal” is identified with the preservation of God’s uniqueness. See Num 25.1-13; 1 Macc. 4.8-11 (cf. 4.30-33; 7.36-38); 2 Macc. 1.24-29; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.145-58; Philo, *Spec.* 1.54-7.

⁵⁵ In Jewish tradition, martyrdom was often associated with, and indeed grounded in, fidelity to God as expressed in the *Shema*. Akiba, for instance, dies with the prolonged word “one” on his lips, glad of the opportunity to love God with “all his soul” (b. Ber 61b).

⁵⁶ In Mark 2.7, Jesus’ opponents regard his words as an affront to “the one God” (εἷς ὁ θεός). If John knew Mark, he may have drawn on elements of this narrative for his Bethesda healing (5.5-9). In addition to the blasphemy theme, both narratives feature a paralytic; both highlight the relationship between the healing and the authority of the/a son of man (Mk 2.10; John 5.27); and the language in John 5.8 bears some resemblance to that in Mark 2.11 (Compare Mk 2.11 σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου with John 5.8 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει). Moreover, as Dodd pointed out, the “artificial” connection generated between Jesus’ discourse (John 5.19-47) and the healing by a question of Sabbath observance suggests that John “did not compose the story freely as an introduction to the dialogue...[but] has utilized traditional material and made it serve his purpose as best he could.” Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, 178. If John was drawing, in part, upon Mark 2, Jesus’ concern for τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ (5.44) may represent John’s reformulation of and response to the Pharisees’ conviction about the one God εἷς ὁ θεός (Mk 2.7).

⁵⁷ Love *for* God. It is possible, however, that this means instead “the love which corresponds to God and his love, the love which is a sign of the children of God.” Schnackenburg, II: 127.

⁵⁸ Michael Labahn, “Deuteronomy in John’s Gospel,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 96. See also Augenstein, *Das Liebesgebot*, 60-62; Beasley-Murray, 70.

⁵⁹ This may reflect conscious interaction with the *Shema*. See Beutler, “Das Hauptgebot,” 229-231. Labahn, “Deuteronomy in John’s Gospel,” 96.

this context, it is difficult not to regard the claim of 10.30 as consciously interacting with the *Shema*, and including Jesus within it: “I and the Father are *one* (ἐν).”⁶⁰ Somehow Jesus himself is included within that which constitutes the exclusivity and uniqueness of God. The reaction of the Jews suggests they regarded the claim to be of such strength.

Therefore, John’s “oneness” language reflects a more profound association between Father and Son than can be accommodated by the category of “functional unity.” This is not to say that the oneness is, instead, ontological,⁶¹ as this category is equally foreign to John’s thought. However, since the claim to oneness is grounded in the fact that the works are done “in my Father’s Name,” it may well be that the Name itself which characterizes these works signals far more than is encompassed by the categories of agency or functional unity. For John, the Name signifies the association of Father and Son which is disclosed in the works Jesus achieves. Jesus does works “in my Father’s name,” not primarily to identify himself as an authorized agent, but as one with the Father. The Name signifies an association between Father and Son that is best described in Jesus’ claim “I and the Father are one.”

Impetus

Not only has John adopted an expression from the Entry tradition and made it his own, he has reformulated it in such a way that it signifies more than mere agency. The expression means Jesus’ disclosure of the Father, and the Name within that expression signifies the profound association

⁶⁰ Several scholars have suggested the *Shema* undergirds this claim: Barrett, “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” 161-162. Richard Bauckham, “Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John,” in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2007), 250. Idem, “Divine and Human Community,” in *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 32-34. Stephen C. Barton, “The Unity of Humankind as a Theme in Biblical Theology,” in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Craig Bartholomew et. al. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 242-253. Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 464. Keener, I: 826. Thomas Söding, “‘Ich und der Vater sind Eins’ (Joh 10, 30). Die johanneische Christologie vor dem Anspruch des Hauptgebotes (Dtn 6,4f.),” *ZNW* 93 (2002): 177-199. Many scholars who object to the influence of the *Shema* upon John 10.33 point out that the form (ἐν) does not accord with Deuteronomy 6.4 (ἐἷς). However, John may simply have altered the noun case to fit his own sentence structure. See Bauckham, “Monotheism,” 250.

⁶¹ As suggested by, e.g., Obermann: “Die hier angesprochene Einheit ist wesentlich eine Einheit im Ursprung (so 1,1-3 mit 1,12; 7.29) und *im Wesen* (z.b. 8,8.19).” Obermann, *Erfüllung*, 171. Similarly Bultmann, 387; Barrett, 382; Lindars, 371; Painter, “Tradition, History, and Interpretation in John 10,” 69; Dunn, “Let John be John,” 329.

between Father and Son which is expressed in Jesus' claim to oneness with the Father. What impetus may have generated John's interest in the expression, and the significance of the Name within it? Although the meaning and function of the language in 5.43 and 10.25 may reflect more than one influence, it will be argued here that Isaiah was the primary impetus for the associative significance of the divine Name reflected in these passages.

Synoptic Tradition

Since John rarely uses traditions reflected in the Synoptics,⁶² it is worth attending to the ones he does use. John's interest in the citation of Psalm 117[118].26 is confirmed by his reformulation of the expression "in my Father's name" twice:

εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (12.13)

ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου (5.43)

τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου (10.25)

Since the expression "coming in the name" is relatively rare in Jewish and NT tradition,⁶³ its repetition in John 5.43 and 10.25 most likely represents John's adaptation of that passage.⁶⁴ Indeed, the text of Psalm 117[118].26 may (alongside Zechariah 9) be "remembered" by the disciples after Jesus' glorification (12.16).⁶⁵ In the context of the Spirit's role of "reminding" believers (14.26), this remembering probably indicates Spirit-illuminated exegesis of these passages, which could be reflected in the reformulations.⁶⁶

⁶² Of John's roughly 14 explicit OT citations, only 5 are adopted from the tradition reflected likewise in the Synoptics: (i) Isa 40.3 in John 1.23; cf. Matt 3.3; Mk 1.3; Luke 3.4; (ii) Psalm 117[118].26 in John 12.13; cf. Matt 21.9; Mk 11.9-10; (iii) Zech 9.9 in John 12.15; cf. Matt 21.5; (iv) Isa 6.10 in John 12.40; cf. Matt 13.15; Mk 4.12; (v) Zech 12.10 in John 19.37; cf. Matt 24.30.

⁶³ Although various figures speak or act "in the name" of someone in Jewish tradition, "coming in the name" occurs rarely, and only in connection with God's name (2 Chr 14.11; Ps 117[118].26; cf. with πορεύομαι in 1 Sam 17.45; Mic 4.5). In the NT, the Synoptics refer to coming in *Jesus'* name (Mk 13.6 and para.; cf. Did. 12.1), but coming in the divine Name, apart from a citation of Psalm 117[118], is unique to GJohn.

⁶⁴ There is little reason to assume that John intends direct allusions to Psalm 117[118] in these passages, *pace* Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 254-255; Brunson, *Psalm 118*, 351-361. See Barrett, 380.

⁶⁵ Michael A. Daise, "Quotations with 'Remembrance' Formulae in the Fourth Gospel," in *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, ed. Alicia Myers and Bruce Schuchard (Atlanta: SBL, 2015), 82-83.

⁶⁶ Although the Spirit reminds believers of *Jesus'* words, not Scripture per se, the two are closely identified in 2.22, and both the Scripture-remembering (12.16) and the Spirit-reminding (14.26; cf. 7.39) were to occur post-resurrection.

Quite possibly the reference to the Name within the expression attracted John's interest—especially since the verb ἔρχομαι (12.13) is replicated only in 5.43, whereas the ὄνομα expression occurs in both 5.43 and 10.25. Interestingly, John seems drawn to Synoptic traditions which refer to the Name,⁶⁷ and there seems to have been reflection on the relationship between the language of “coming” and the divine Name in wider Johannine circles.⁶⁸ Yet, given as he is to adapting traditions for new contexts,⁶⁹ John has reformulated “the name of the Lord” as the distinctively Johannine “my Father’s name.” In addition, he has redeployed the expression in polemical contexts, in which the primary issues at stake are the defense of divine exclusivity, and Jesus’ relation to the Father. Consequently, the Name reflects an associative significance not found in the expression as it occurs in the Synoptic tradition, but which may provide a clue to the catalyst which attracted him to the tradition in the first place.

Agency Tradition

At one level, John’s use of the expression “in the name” (5.43; 10.25; 12.13) functions to identify Jesus as a divinely authorized agent. The function of name language to denote agency goes back to OT passages in which acting or speaking in God’s Name identified a figure as divinely empowered or authorized to act or speak on God’s behalf, notably the “prophet like Moses.”⁷⁰ In keeping with Deuteronomy 18, Jesus comes “from your brothers” (Deut 18.15, cf. John 1.11) and speaks “just as [God] commands” (Deut 18.18, cf. John 7.14-18; 8.28; 12.49-50; 14.10, 24), and his

⁶⁷ It may not be insignificant that, of only three distinct expressions in which the divine Name occurs in the Synoptic tradition, John has seized upon and reformulated two: “coming in the Name of the Lord” (Mk 11.9; Matt 21.9; 23.39; Lk 13.35; 19.38); “hallowed be your Name” (Matt 6.9; Lk 11.2). The third occurs only in Matthew 28.19, which may not have been known to John.

⁶⁸ Ford has argued that the community in which Revelation was produced regarded “one who comes” (Rev 1.4, 8; 4.8; cf. John 6.14; 11.27) as a christological title which they substituted for the traditional expression “one who will be” (Exod 3.14), as an expression of their conviction that Jesus had been included within the divine Name. Ford, “He that Cometh,” 144-147.

⁶⁹ Judith Lieu, “How John Writes,” in *The Written Gospel*, ed. M. Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 181.

⁷⁰ Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, 85-86.; Grether, *Name und Wort*, 23-24.; Bultmann, 270. Moses speaks in God’s Name (Exod 5.23), as does the prophet (Deut 18.19-22; 1 Kgs 22.16; 2 Chr 18.15; 33.18; Ezra 5.1; Zech 13.3; Mal 3.5; Jer 11.21; 14.14-15; 20.9; 23.25; Dan 9.6) and Gad (1 Chr 21.19). Elisha curses in the Name of the Lord (2 Kgs 2.24). The Levites minister and bless in God’s Name (Deut 10.8, 17.12, 18.5, 21.5; 1 Chr 23.13; Sir. 45.15), as does David (2 Sam 6.18, 1 Chr 16.2). And David comes in the Name of the Lord of hosts (1 Sam 17.45), as does the figure who “comes” in the Name of the Lord (Ps 117[118].26).

words come to pass (Deut 18.22; cf. John 13.19). Cumulatively, such observations suggest that John's intent was to present Jesus as the "prophet like Moses."⁷¹

This accords with a broader agency motif which characterizes John's Christology. Many scholars agree that John's presentation of Jesus as sent from the Father is informed to some degree by halakhic principles of agency.⁷² Jesus is God's authorized representative, meaning that everything he says and does is *as if* God himself said or did it. Ashton points out that the agency tradition generated a way of thinking which is reflected throughout John's Christology, as in for instance the recurring "as...so" pattern (5.30; 8.28; 12.50; 14.31). It is one of the "most salient characteristics of Johannine theology,"⁷³ which he suggests may even account for the paradox of Jesus' subordination to the Father and unity with the Father:

In *fact* the king is greater than his emissary; in *law* the emissary is the king's equal. The pendulum swings gently between these two apparently contradictory propositions, with the result that one is sometimes stressed at the expense of the other.⁷⁴

In this context, the "in the name" expressions in 5.43 and 10.25 may be understood as "evidence that the Johannine idea of mission is rooted in ancient Jewish law concerning the authority of messengers."⁷⁵

However, John is also at pains to distinguish Jesus from Moses, and to present him as so much more than Moses and the agency category. In contrast to Moses or any other intermediary figure, Jesus alone has seen God (John 1.18; 3.13).⁷⁶ Moses received and transmitted the Torah from

⁷¹ John 6.14; Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 42-46. Brown draws several parallels between the related passage John 12.47-50 and Deuteronomy 18.18-19. Brown, I: 491-493.

⁷² In his brief but important essay "God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel," Peder Borgen argues that John's Jesus conforms to the basic halakhic principles of "agency": The agent is (1) like the one who sent him (John 12.44; 13.20; 14.9; 15.23), which in the later rabbis was expressed in terms of authority, function, and qualities. He is (2) subordinate to the Sender (John 13.16). He (3) carries out the *mission* of the Sender (John 6.38). He (4) can lay claim (in a forensic sense) to what is rightfully the Sender's (John 12.31-32; 17.6). He (5) must report to the Sender upon completion of his mission (John 13.3; 17.4). And he (6) can appoint an agent of his own (John 20.21). Peder Borgen, "God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel," in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 137-148. Interestingly, however, Borgen does not discuss the significance of Jesus coming "in the name" of the Father. See also Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg*, 270-399.

⁷³ Ashton, *Understanding*, 217.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁷⁵ Schnackenburg, II: 127; also Dodd: Jesus is "commissioned or delegated by God to mankind. In other words, [h]e comes 'in the name' of the Father (v43)." Dodd, *Interpretation*, 254; Similarly Carson, 264; Keener, I: 660.

⁷⁶ Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 297-301.

the One characterized as “full of grace and truth” (cf. Exod 34.6), but the “grace and truth” itself — most likely an allusion to Exodus 34.6⁷⁷ — came through Jesus (John 1.14-17). God gave manna through his agent, Moses, but Jesus is the true bread (John 6.32). Whereas Moses is a subordinate mediator of grace, an agent, Jesus is presented as the very embodiment of divine character. Thus, Schnackenburg points out that what Jesus actually *does* in the Name “reveals such unique authority...that every prophetic mission is here surpassed, even that of Moses.”⁷⁸ And Ashton observes that the themes of mission, agency, and sonship, “do not, even in combination, account for the whole of the Gospel’s high [C]hristology or explain how it was actually generated.”⁷⁹ He goes on to suggest that, “[p]erhaps the investigation of other themes, other strands of the pattern, will enable us to see the full design more clearly.”⁸⁰

This accords with the analysis above, in which the Name in 5.43 and 10.25 means the exercise of divine prerogatives, and signifies the profound association of Father and Son. Thus Untergassmair argues that Jesus’ coming or acting “in the Name” cannot be explained solely in terms of OT agency expressions.⁸¹ John has adopted a standard expression of agency, but the associative significance of the Name within the expression is indicative of a mutation of the agency category. Thus, the impetus of the distinctive significance of the Name in 5.43 and 10.25 must lie elsewhere.

Isaiah

Of course, the Name expressions in 5.43 or 10.25 do not represent allusions to any passage in Isaiah. However, it is here proposed that Isaiah was the primary impetus behind the significance of the Name reflected in these passages. It may not be coincidental that two passages which feature charges of blasphemy against Jesus (5.17-47; 10.22-39) also feature his self-defense in terms of the divine Name (5.43; 10.25). John may have deployed his reformulated “in the name”

⁷⁷ See discussion in chapter 2.

⁷⁸ Schnackenburg, II: 127.

⁷⁹ Ashton, *Understanding*, 232.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Untergassmair, *Im Namen Jesu*, 55. Cf. Idem, *Im Namen Jesu Beten* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990), 48-49.

expression in polemical contexts because the divine Name occurs at the heart of the trial scenes of Deutero-Isaiah.⁸²

John 5.19-47 and 10.22-39 are key episodes in the forensic motif which John adopts from Isaiah.⁸³ As in Isaiah, so in John 5, the one defending himself turns out to be the judge, and the accusers become the accused.⁸⁴ And just as YHWH testifies to his own unique sovereign identity in Isaiah 43, so God appears in John 5.37-38 as the primary witness to himself by testifying to Jesus:

[T]he Johannine idea of witness is closely related to God's witness to himself in the Old Testament. In bringing his "case" against the false gods, the only witness whom Yahweh can call is, ultimately, himself, through his dealings with Israel (Isa 43.8-13)...In John, of course, the theme becomes Christological: God reveals himself in Jesus and testifies to himself in the works which Jesus performs.⁸⁵

There are likewise some interesting parallels between the trial of Isaiah 43.8-13 and John 10.25-39. Having called his people "by your name" (Isa 43.1) and promised to gather (ἄγω) them from the earth (Isa 43.7), God summons blind and deaf Israel (Isa 43.8) as his witness alongside his chosen Servant (Isa 43.10). The goal of the trial is that they would know that God alone saves and "no one delivers from my hands" (Isa 43.11-13), and ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι (43.10). In John 10, Jesus speaks of calling his own sheep by name (v3) and bringing (ἄγω) "other sheep" (v16), before he is opposed in a trial scene by those who are deaf to his voice (vv.26-27) and blind to him (cf. 9.40-41). As in Isaiah, Jesus gives "eternal life" to his sheep, and no one can snatch them out of his hand (v28), and the goal of the trial is ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε⁸⁶ ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ (10.38).⁸⁷ In addition to this, it was noted earlier that the parallel claims to oneness and mutual indwelling (10.30, 38) appear to echo the declaration "I am" as expressed in 8.28 and

⁸² E.g., Isa 42.8; 48.9, 11; 52.5-6. See discussion of the polemical function of the Name in Isaiah in chapter 1.

⁸³ See chapter 1, n.152, 153. Lincoln, *Truth*, 45-46. Truex, "Blasphemy," 62-64.

⁸⁴ See Lincoln, *Truth*, 73, 81.

⁸⁵ Schnackenburg, II: 121.

⁸⁶ The variant πιστεύσητε makes the link with Isaiah 43.10 even more plausible. Tempting though this is, it is unwise to downplay the strong attestation for γινώσκητε (see above n.46).

⁸⁷ Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 143-144. Also Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," 161-162.

13.19—two passages which are demonstrably indebted to Isaiah 43.10.⁸⁸ Since John likely regarded the “I am” sayings in Isaiah alongside Isaiah’s Name concept, which in turn is featured as a primary issue at stake in the Isaianic trials, it may be Isaiah which generated the use of the Name expression in the polemical contexts of 5.43 and 10.25.

In this context, it may be the associative significance of the Name within Isaiah which granted John a means of presenting Jesus as the measure of fidelity to God’s own Name, and as the object of the Father’s witness to himself. Just as the Isaianic Servant is simultaneously a witness to God (43.10) and the locus of revelation (52.6-10) and trust (42.5; 50.10), as well as bound up with the glorification and revelation of the divine Name (42.5-8; 52.6-10), so in GJohn, God’s witness to Jesus is inseparable from his defense of his own Name (5.37-43; 12.28). And it is ultimately Jesus, not the religious leaders, who defends God’s glory and Name (5.43-44; 10.25, 38).

Furthermore, the eschatological significance of the Name in Isaiah may have been the catalyst for the use of these agency expressions in the context of Jesus’ revelatory works. The Name in which Jesus’ comes authorizes Jesus to exercise divine prerogatives in the “works” (5.43) which are later summarized as Name-revelation (17.6); and the works themselves are characterized by the Name (10.25). Since the characterization of Jesus’ eschatological mission as one of Name-revelation is demonstrably indebted to Isaiah, John’s use of these agency expressions in relation to that mission may reflect the same influence. An Isaianic impetus could also account for the parallelism between Name and glory in 5.43-44. For John, the “glory from the Father” is that seen by Isaiah (12.41), and by the witnesses of 1.14—who represent the fulfillment of the eschatological vision of Isaiah 40.5. It is plausible, then, that John was motivated to reformulate the tradition reflected in 12.13 in 5.43 and 10.25 because of the significance of the Name in Isaiah.

Conclusion

In the foregoing survey of the Johannine uses of the “in the Name” expression, it has been argued that John adopts a standard expression of agency, but deploys it in ways that reflect his own concerns. In both passages (5.43; 10.25), the divine Name functions primarily to authorize Jesus,

⁸⁸ See chapter 1. Williams makes a parallel suggestion to the one I make here—that John may well have drawn on traditional material for his “I am” sayings, but then modified it in light of passages in Isaiah to highlight the theophanic significance of the expression. Williams, “‘I Am’ or ‘I Am He’?”, 345-348.

but goes beyond the agency category to mean the divine prerogatives which are disclosed in Jesus' coming and action. Furthermore, the Name signifies the association of Father and Son in a way that is best described in the language of oneness. And insofar as his coming is bound up with the arrival of his eschatological hour, and his works constitutive of his eschatological mission, that Name which characterizes works and coming carries an eschatological significance.

The function of the expression to authorize Jesus is understandable as influenced by the tradition reflected in the Synoptic Entry narrative, and in the context of halakhic principles of agency. However the revelatory meaning of the expression as a whole, combined with its use in forensic contexts, and the associative and eschatological significance of the Name within the expression, encourage us to look, instead, to Isaiah for the primary impetus to John's attraction to the tradition which underlies 12.13. Although the expression derives ultimately from Psalm 117[118], the impetus behind John's appropriation and reformulation of the language is Isaianic.

Conclusion

Thesis Summary

In the foregoing thesis, I have endeavoured to establish, not only that John was particularly attracted to the divine Name concept, but that he did so out of a conviction that the divine Name was eschatological and associative in significance. Furthermore, Isaiah was instrumental in forming this conviction in John's thinking. This does not preclude the fact that other texts and traditions have likely influenced John's divine Name concept, or that the resulting synthesis is distinctively Johannine. However, if the question of *impetus* is distinguished from that of *influence*, it becomes possible to speak of texts and traditions to which John may not directly allude in his Name expressions, but yet have generated his interest in the Name category and his emphasis on the Name and reformulations of Name expressions which occurred in prior Christian tradition.

In the Introduction, I noted the unique emphasis John places on the divine Name: It occurs frequently, in a range of different kinds of expression, and at key points in the narrative which suggest its importance. Furthermore, in 5.43 and 10.25, John has reformulated the Name expression from prior Christian tradition (12.13). Since Christian tradition had already shifted various functions of the divine Name to Jesus' name, this unique return to the Father's Name requires an explanation.

In chapter one (Part 1), I argued for the plausibility of John's indebtedness to Isaiah for his distinctive interest in the divine Name concept. John was clearly familiar with and dependent upon Isaiah. Moreover, within Isaiah, the divine Name is intertwined with divine glory and the expression "I am"—both of which John most likely appropriated in his own Gospel. I also noted that, within Isaiah, the divine Name is featured as a key issue at stake in polemical contexts and particularly eschatological; moreover, it is associative in significance—within the HB itself, and then more explicitly in the LXX translation and in other Jewish interpreters of Isaiah.

In the following three chapters (Part 2), I analyzed the expressions in GJohn in which the divine Name occurs. I distinguished the significance of the Name from its referent, meaning, and function, and suggested that the significance of the Name represents the fundamental conviction with which he regarded the category, and thus provides us with an indication of the impetus behind his interest in the divine Name.

Within the expressions of Name-revelation and Name-glorification (12.28; 17.6, 26), the divine Name functions to summarize the whole of Jesus' revelatory mission, and thus it means the character and action of the Father, which is expressed uniquely in the Son. However, since that which is revealed is simultaneously the Father and the Son, the Name is fundamentally associative in significance. Furthermore, the summative function of the Name for Jesus' eschatological mission, both completed and ongoing, indicates that John regarded the Name category as fundamentally eschatological in significance.

Within the Name-giving expression (17.11-12), the divine Name means divine prerogatives and character expressed through action, and it functions to authorize Jesus and legitimate lofty claims made for or by him. Within the Name-keeping expression, the Name means the locus of fidelity to God, and functions to identify Jesus' followers as the people of God. However, in both expressions, the significance of the Name is associative: The locus of fidelity to the Father is Jesus, precisely because the Name is shared between Father and Son. And the Name is eschatological: The Name-giving undergirds Jesus' eschatological mission of Name-revelation and Name-keeping.

Finally, in chapter 4, I considered John's reformulations (5.43; 10.25) of the agency expression "blessed is he who comes in the Name of the Lord" (12.13). As a whole, the expressions mean the revelation of divine prerogatives, whereas the Name within these expressions means the prerogatives which are revealed in Jesus' coming and action. Furthermore, the Name functions within these agency expressions to authorize Jesus. However, John goes beyond the normal bounds of the agency category, since the Name signifies the profound association of Father and Son, which is described in the language of oneness, and generates charges of blasphemy.

In each of these three chapters, I concluded by exploring various possible influences on John's divine Name concept. It is likely that John was familiar with language and concepts which are reflected elsewhere in Christian tradition. The meaning of the Name as the locus of fidelity or as divine character or action is informed by a wider Jewish context. And the function of the Name to authorize Jesus has a parallel in Name Angel traditions, and is reminiscent of halakhic principles of agency. Thus it is appropriate to discuss these various influences on John's thought at the level of meaning and function. However, the associative and eschatological significance of the divine Name in John's Name expressions indicates an additional aspect of the Name which transcends discussions of influence. John's interest in the divine Name category is tied to its significance, which bears striking resemblance to the significance of the Name in Isaiah. Thus,

although a single explanation for John's divine Name concept must be resisted, I conclude that the associative and eschatological significance of the Name in Isaiah was a primary impetus behind John's *interest* in the divine Name.

Thesis Implications

Sociological Impetus

At this point, it may be objected that, since other NT authors knew and drew upon the text of Isaiah and yet did not emphasize the divine Name, Isaiah alone is insufficient to account fully for John's distinctive interest in the divine Name. Alongside the conceptual impetus supplied by Isaiah, we may propose that John's interest in the Name was generated by a socio-historical impetus. A thorough investigation of this is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, we may submit two tentative, mutually-reinforcing suggestions, which in turn support the foregoing thesis.

First, it is plausible that John's interest in the Name reflects a polemical context faced by believers for whom he wrote or with whom he was familiar, in which the divine Name in particular was a sensitive touch-point. Many scholars agree that references to ἀποσυνάγωγος (John 9.22; 12.42; 16.2) and the polemical tone of GJohn may reflect a general context of "turf-warfare" between John's readers and Jewish opponents in which questions of identity, fidelity to God, and proper worship were at the fore.¹ Notably, in Truex's reconstruction of this context, the

¹ J. L. Martyn famously proposed that GJohn reflects two levels—the Jesus story, and the experience of the Johannine "community." J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968). Similarly Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979). There are two major types of criticism against this—historical and methodological. Historically, we simply do not know much about the relationship between Jews and Christians in the period in which GJohn was produced. Most scholars now agree, *pace* Martyn, that the *Birkat-ha-minim* is likely not the immediate context for the "expulsion" passages in GJohn (9.22; 12.42; 16.2). See Raimo Hakola, *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 41-55. But cursing of Christians in synagogues is attested in the mid-second century (see Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 16.4; 96.2). In addition, it is methodologically irresponsible to draw a direct line between a proposed sociological context and the literary aim(s) of the author. There is no parallel for this within the *bios* genre. Tobias Hägerland, "John's Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?" *JSNT* 25 (2003): 309-316. And the notion that every aspect of the Gospel reflects some aspect of John's wider environment overlooks John's awareness of the distinction between the historical Jesus and later Spirit-inspired memory of him, as well as his intent to preserve that memory (2.19-22). *Ibid.*, 316-321. Also Edward W. Klink III, *Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), esp. 115-151. Richard Bauckham, "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel," in *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids,

charges of blasphemy against Jesus reflect accusations against John's community regarding three "points of sensitivity" or "flashpoints": Jesus' equality with the Father, the transfer of Temple symbolism to Jesus, and polemic against the Jews/Jewish leadership.² In her unpublished thesis, Lori Baron develops a similar argument that John's emphasis on the oneness of Father and Son was generated by a heightened stress on the *Shema* in Jewish circles, in which christological convictions would have been regarded as an assault on the oneness of God.³

Although it must remain a speculation, it is plausible that, like themes such as "equality," Temple symbolism, or perhaps the *Shema*, the divine Name itself represents a "flashpoint" in the experience of the believers known to John.⁴ The Name is closely related to these other possible "flashpoints."⁵ Furthermore, within the discursive world of the text, the divine Name is the central issue at stake in the trial motif drawn from Isaiah (12.28), and it is important that Jesus' community be identified by the Name (17.11-12).⁶ Since charges of blasphemy within the Gospel were elicited by claims made about Jesus, it is likely that charges against later believers arose,

MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 113-136. Nevertheless, despite these valid criticisms, it remains plausible at least that some experience of conflict amongst believers John knew can help account for the presence of the controversy narratives in GJohn, for he himself confesses that he was attracted to certain aspects of the Jesus tradition because of their poignancy for his readers (20.30-31), and explicitly connects the prospect of synagogue expulsion with opposition to Jesus (15.18-16.2).

² Truex argues that these "flashpoints" are exposed by unique or distinctive language, the vehemence of Jewish reaction, and surrounding polemic. Truex, "Blasphemy," 187-265. Similarly, Loader, *Christology*, 161.

³ See Lori Baron, "The Shema in John's Gospel Against Its Backgrounds in Second Temple Judaism" (Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University, 2015). See also discussion in chapter 4.

⁴ McGrath makes a similar suggestion: "The claims made by Christians that Jesus bore the divine name, and was the mediator or source of eternal life, were objected to by 'the Jews', and the Fourth Gospel seeks to respond to those objections." McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, 109. The weakness of McGrath's wider discussion here (*ibid.*, 107-115) is that he attributes the unique emphasis on the Name and its unique expressions ultimately to sociological factors, which must remain speculative. However, a more plausible explanation for John's distinctive Name concept may be found better in a combination of both sociological and conceptual catalysts.

⁵ The heart of the concept of blasphemy, which Truex suggests was generated by applying "equality" and Temple language to Jesus is, of course, profanation of the divine Name (see e.g., Lev 24.16; Philo, *Mos.* 2.203-208; m. Sanh. 7.5). And the Name was central to the *Shema*. Name and *Shema* are closely linked in various passages. See, e.g., Zech 14.9; 2 Bar 48.23-24; 1 Clem. 43.6; Sifre Deut §§ 31, 306. Also the liturgical response to the *Shema* was "Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever" (b. Pesah. 56a). Translation from *Pesahim*, trans. Rabbi Freedman (London: Soncino Press, 1967). And in one Merkabah text, the divine Name is "One" (perhaps drawing upon Zechariah 14.9: "In that day, the Lord will be one, and his name one") (*Ma'asseh Merkabah* §§ 562, 567, 589, 592, 593). This text likely dates from between the fourth and seventh centuries AD. Rowland and Morray-Jones, *Mystery of God*, 250-252.

⁶ Similarly, in Revelation, the central mark of identity is the name of the beast or the divine Name (Rev 7.3; 14.1, 9; 22.4).

similarly, in response to convictions expressed or practiced regarding Jesus. These convictions are most likely akin to those reflected in the Gospel itself, which could well have elicited the charge of blaspheming the divine Name.⁷ Indeed, it is reasonable to surmise that followers of Jesus were being charged, in particular, with profaning the divine Name.⁸ Since the divine Name was at the center of Jewish faith and practice, it would have been a natural battle-ground for communities competing for the same identity.⁹ This could account for the prominence of the Name throughout GJohn, as well as the identification of believers “in your Name” in 17.11-12.

In such a conflict over fidelity to the divine Name, it is also plausible that certain passages in Isaiah in particular could have been leveraged against early believers. It is probable that the prominent place of the “consolation” portion of Isaiah (chapters 40-61) in the *Haftaroth* reflects the prominence of Isaiah in first century synagogue practices.¹⁰ More specifically, Segal identifies Isaiah 41.4 and 44.6 along with Exodus 20.2 and Deuteronomy 32.39 as key passages used in defense of the uniqueness of God over-against the “two powers” heresy.¹¹ Rabba Abahu (purportedly) deployed Isaiah 44.6, likely against Christians: “But God said, ‘I am the first,’ for I have no father, and ‘I am the last’ for I have no brother, and ‘besides me there is no God,’ for I have no son” (Midr. Exod 29.5).¹² Although this tradition post-dates GJohn, and so should not be

⁷ E.g., the confession of the community: “we beheld his glory” (1.14), of Peter: “you are the holy one of God” (6.69), and of Thomas: “my Lord and my God” (20.28). Note, however, that John does not regard the two divine Names YHWH and Elohim as indicating separate deities. The rabbis counteracted others who held such views by identifying these names with divine *attributes*. But, for John, Jesus is both “Lord” and “God.”

⁸ This need not necessarily conflict with other proposals. Wendy North, for instance, suggests that the locus of the conflict between Jews and Christians that generated GJohn was Moses, since he is the common factor shared by the three broad groups in GJohn: the antagonistic Jews, non-hostile Jews with a “signs faith,” and faithful Johannine believers. Wendy S. North, “Monotheism and the Gospel of John: Jesus, Moses and the Law,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 155-166.

⁹ In addition, Jesus promised that his followers would face opposition “because of my name” (15.21), and in 3 John 7, believers are said to have gone out “on behalf of the name.” Although unremarkable on their own, these comments may similarly reflect a “flashpoint” sensitivity around name language, when placed in the context of these observations.

¹⁰ E.g., Lk 4.17-20. See John Sawyer, *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 24-25.

¹¹ Segal, *Two Powers*, 37. For instance, Isaiah 44.6 is used against “two powers” heresy in Sifre Deut § 329 (see *Ibid.*, 84-89). See similarly Mek. Exod 20.2.

¹² Translation from *Midrash Rabbah: Exodus*, trans. Rabbi Lehrman (London: Soncino Press, 1961), 339-340. Rabba Abbahu, here cited, was a third generation Amora. Thus the tradition likely dates from ca. AD 300.

leaned upon, it could reflect the kind of use to which Isaiah was put in the first century, as Barrett opines: “It is very probably that such pronouncements were made whenever Jews and Christians came into conflict.”¹³ Hurtado makes a similar point about Isaiah 42.8 (“...my glory I will not give to another...”), which, as noted in chapter 1, was the basis for Trypho’s charge that Christian worship was an affront to God: “I think it a safe bet that Christians did not have to wait until the mid-second century to have this text thrown at them by Jewish opponents of their veneration of Jesus.”¹⁴ John certainly thought that Jews used Scripture to legitimate their rejection of Jesus (e.g., 7.42, 52). Passages such as Isaiah 42.8 may well have been among them, and consequently have made the divine Name a sensitive flash-point for the believers known to John.

The Jewish use of passages in Isaiah against early Christians would have highlighted the exegesis of these very passages as a battleground in the conflict between these emerging groups.¹⁵ John’s Gospel reflects the conviction of believers committed to understanding themselves in relation to Scripture, over-against others who do the same.¹⁶ As one of the primary issues at stake in the polemical discourses of Isaiah, the divine Name was a category which invited John’s christological appropriation. Thus it occurs in GJohn in polemical contexts featuring blasphemy charges (5.43; 10.25), as the central issue in Jesus’ eschatological hour (12.28), and as summative of Jesus’ whole eschatological mission (17.6, 26). But it is the associative and eschatological significance of the Name in Isaiah which granted John the exegetical leverage by which he could align Jesus with the divine Name. In doing so, John first defends the veneration paid to Jesus by Christians, and legitimates the use of Jesus’ name as a locus of faith, and as effective in prayer.¹⁷ Second, John is able to turn charges back on the opponents of believers. For John, those who reject the oneness of Jesus with the Father or indeed the significance of the Name as both the Father’s and as given to the Son, are the true blasphemers who have cut themselves off from the people of God (1.11; 19.15).¹⁸ Similarly, since Jesus is identified with eschatological divine Name-revelation promised in Isaiah 52.6, opponents of Jesus functionally align themselves with those

¹³ Barrett, 383.

¹⁴ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 387.

¹⁵ Segal, *Two Powers*, 154.

¹⁶ Compare 5.39, 45-47 with 10.35 and the emphasis on “fulfillment” (12.28; 13.18; 15.25; 17.12; 19.24, 28, 36).

¹⁷ This accords with John’s broader concern to legitimate Jesus and the faith of the community in him. See, e.g., McGrath, *John’s Apologetic Christology*.

¹⁸ Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment*, 248.

who “blaspheme” the Name in Isaiah 52.5: “because of you my name is continually blasphemed (βλασφημεῖται).”¹⁹

Corresponding to this polemical impetus is a pastoral impetus: If believers with whom John was familiar had faced significant opposition from Jews for their fidelity to Jesus, they may well have been experiencing a crisis of identity. Was their belief in Jesus and his name misplaced? Why had more not believed? Would Judas become representative of a growing number of believers defecting (cf. 1 John 2.19)? These concerns may well have been compounded by the apparent delay in Jesus’ anticipated return. Several scholars have detected these pastoral concerns in various studies approaching GJohn from different angles. In his investigation into the social function of John’s mythic language of ascent/descent, Wayne Meeks suggested that John’s presentation of Jesus was created to encourage his community that separation and isolation was part of being with Jesus; the Gospel justified the existence of the community.²⁰ More recently, Frey has argued persuasively that, although John retains elements of a traditional future eschatology in his Gospel, the eschatological material in his Gospel—both realized and future—functions to comfort beleaguered Christians.²¹ Stibbe notes that the social function of narrative in GJohn is “...to bring encouragement, vindication and purpose to Johannine Christians in the wake of the traumatic associalization which, no doubt, this controversy produced.”²² Clark-Soles makes a similar point about the social function of John’s use of Scripture: “Scripture is a tool for legitimating their own emergence and downplaying their relative newness by grounding the group solidly in the past as represented by Scripture...[and is used] to define and elevate the insiders.”²³ And Zimmermann echoes similar sentiments in her discussion of John’s Father-Son language:

¹⁹ This pattern of thought is seen in John 5.37-47, where those who reject Jesus reveal that they have never seen God and do not know their own Scriptures. Although they think they do God’s will (16.2), by rejecting Jesus, they fail to do so (7.17). So Hamid-Khani observes: “If ‘the Jews’ justified their refusal to accept Jesus’ [m]essianic claims by appealing to the Scriptures, the Fourth Evangelist uses the self-same Scriptures to show that Jesus is the [m]essiah.” Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment*, 251.

²⁰ Wayne A. Meeks, “The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism,” *JBL* 91 (1972): 44-72.

²¹ Jörg Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, 3: 235-236. Idem, “Eschatology in the Johannine Circle,” 47-82.

²² Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, 61.

²³ Jamie Clark-Soles, *Scripture Cannot be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 318.

Angesichts einer Gemeindesituation, die sich von der Synagoge getrennt sieht..., hat die Vaterbezeichnung eine stark gemeinschaftsbildende Funktion: die Trennung von Synagoge und Welt wird kompensiert durch das neue Selbstverständnis der Christen als τέκνα θεοῦ—nicht wie die Juden als υἱοὶ θεοῦ—, die in die Einheit von Vater und Sohn mithineingenommen sind.²⁴

In this context, John's alignment of Jesus and his mission with the anticipated eschatological revelation of the divine Name may well be due to a concern amongst believers that their faith was misplaced, that in Jesus they had not in fact secured access to the Father.²⁵ Throughout this thesis, I have outlined ways in which the divine Name functions to legitimate Jesus or to identify believers. John assures believers that they encounter Jesus himself in the Spirit because he comes in Jesus' name (14.26) and similarly that they encounter in Jesus the action and character of God himself, because he comes and acts in the divine Name (5.43; 10.25). Likewise, because Jesus has revealed the divine Name, with which he is endowed (17.6, 11-12, 26), his own name is efficacious for prayer (16.24) and the locus of faith (1.12).²⁶ And because Jesus has disclosed the divine Name, his followers alone know "the only true God" (17.3) and may thereby appropriately worship, since "we worship what we know" (4.22).²⁷ Finally, with the promise that the Father himself would "keep" believers in the divine Name (17.11) and that eschatological divine Name-revelation would continue among future generations of believers (17.26b), John

²⁴ Zimmermann, *Die Namen des Vaters*, 124-25.

²⁵ One does not have far to go in Jewish tradition to find that an emphasis on the divine Name often reflects challenges surrounding the idea of the visibility or presence of God. In Exodus, the idea of God's invisibility (33.20) is illustrated by the aural alternative to Moses' request to see divine glory (33.18) in which God instead declares his own Name (34.5-7). Von Rad argued that the Name language in Deuteronomy reflected a theological development in which God was distanced from the place of his dwelling. Von Rad, *Theology*, vol. 1, 184. Mettinger suggests similarly that a less fixed or enthroned conception of God was generated by the destabilization of the exile. Tryggve Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982), 50. And Orlov argues that, over-against certain mystical traditions, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* avoids depicting a vision of God, and features instead a "voice from the fire" and a heavenly vision mediated by a Name-bearing angel. Andrei Orlov, "Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*," *JBL* 127 (2008): 53-70.

²⁶ As discussed in chapter 2, the divine Name was central to effective invocation. Furthermore, in addition to the *Shema*, the divine Name was featured in prayers which may have been in use in the first century, such as the third Benediction: "Thou art holy and thy name is awesome and there is no god beside thee." Translation from Heinemann, *Prayer*, 27. For its use in the first century, see Instone-Brewer, *Traditions of the Rabbis*, I: 52-119. Also the *Kaddish* (see chapter 2, n.178).

²⁷ Some recognize in the "we" sayings (e.g., 1.14-16; 3.11; 4.22; 21.24) the confessions of John's community. Perhaps in 4.22, "we worship what we know," Jesus speaks for the future community of believers. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, 103-104.

comforts his readers with the promise that they are not at a disadvantage for not having seen Jesus themselves (cf. 20.29), and that a delay in Jesus' return does not detract from the fact that they live in an era of eschatological fulfillment. John's identification of Jesus with the eschatological Name helps him to communicate the realization of eschatological climax, which must be seen (cf. Isa 40.5) to believers for whom sight is not an option. And the divine Name identifies them as the heirs of the people of God, who have been and will be kept in that Name (17.11-12). As Shirbourn puts it, the Name "links [future believers] to previous generations" and thus "would be a symbol of reassurance."²⁸ Through faith in Jesus' name, they abide with previous generations of believers in the Name of the Father himself.

In this particular pastoral situation, it would have been natural for John to turn to Isaiah. As mentioned earlier, it is likely that passages from the "consolation" section of Isaiah were commonly read in the synagogue (e.g., Lk 4.17-20). And interestingly, Isaiah 56-66 itself appears to have been composed by those familiar with the experience of being shunned "for my name's sake:" "...Your brothers who hate you and reject you because of my name said 'may the Lord be glorified that we may see your joy'; but they will be shamed" (Isa 66.5MT; cf. 65.13-14). Likely composed by the same figure/group, Isaiah 30.19-21 reflects a situation in which a minority group who consider themselves the faithful remnant are promised a prophetic leader, as Blenkinsopp suggests: "After a time of deprivation and sorrow they will see him, not in person, as no doubt they had done in the past, but as an inspiring presence in their lives...."²⁹ In the Farewell Discourse(s), Jesus comforts his followers with similar language. He addresses those who will suffer for his name (15.21) at the hands of those who think they honour God (16.2). And after their sorrow, they will experience joy (16.20-22), like a woman after her labour (16.21).³⁰ It is no wonder that adherents of both Christianity and Qumran raided Isaiah for language with which to identify themselves.³¹ Thus it would have been natural for John to turn to Isaiah for the pastoral encouragement his community desired as or if they faced the charge of having profaned the divine Name. As John summoned Isaiah as a witness to Jesus, so he draws upon Isaiah's emphasis

²⁸ Shirbourn, "Giving," 289. Similarly, Ruck-Schröder connects the explosion of name statements in GJohn to the challenge posed by the time of Jesus' departure and absence. Ruck-Schröder, *Der Name*, 213.

²⁹ Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 257. Cf. similar the experience of the Damascus community, who await the coming of their "Teacher" (CD I.8-11).

³⁰ Cf. Isa 26.17-19; 65.23; 66.7-9. See Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 68, 218.

³¹ Both groups adopted Isaianic designations such as "the many," "the way," "righteous," "servants," "elect," etc. See Blenkinsopp, *Opening*, 92-93, 169-221.

on the divine Name to legitimate the allegiance of believers to Jesus, and in so doing, appropriates the comforting function of Isaianic categories, such as the divine Name, for his own readers.

The Present Work in Relation to Johannine Theology

This study has highlighted the importance of a mostly overlooked category for understanding John's presentation of Jesus: the divine Name. The implications of the present study reinforce and underline at least two features of John's Christology that should not be overlooked.

First, John regards Jesus as a fundamentally eschatological figure. The prominent position of the *Logos* in the prologue has seduced scholars into giving it more attention than, perhaps, it deserves. Although there may be a hint of Johannine *Logos* Christology outside the prologue in 10.35, the divine Name appears to have been a more pervasive category of thought for John. Jesus is not primarily the object of idealized philosophical speculation. Rather, he is given the Name in order to reveal it and keep believers in it, as the prophets anticipated. His earthly mission embodies the anticipated action of God. It is only because he first "became flesh and dwelt among us" and displayed "his glory," that he could then, by inference, be regarded as the *Logos*.

Second, the "associative" significance of the Name opens a window into the "God" of GJohn, and helpfully captures the key Father-Son dynamic in Johannine Christology. On the one hand, by identifying Jesus with the divine Name, John presents Jesus in the highest terms available to him. This helps to nuance the more binary dichotomies drawn between "ontological" and "functional" or "high" and "subordinationist" christologies. Jesus is not merely a divine agent or "functionally" one with the Father. Rather, in the presentation of Jesus in terms of the distinctively Jewish category of the divine Name, the whole understanding of God is transformed in GJohn. Although the divine Name refers in the first instance to the Father, it is no longer merely the *divine* Name. Rather it is a category redefined by Jesus. The glorification of the Name is bound up with Jesus' glorification (12.28). The Name Jesus reveals and in which believers are kept is fundamentally both "your Name" and the Name "which you gave me" (17.11). And future Name-revelation is inextricably linked with Jesus' self-revelation. The associative significance of the Name aptly captures the tensions within Johannine Christology, noted by others.³²

³² E.g., Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).

On the other hand, John is concerned as much with theology as with Christology. It is surely striking that, in the midst of a shift in prior and contemporaneous Christian tradition toward Jesus' name as a functional divine Name, John pairs an emphasis on Jesus' name with a return to interest in the divine Name. Jesus' mission is about divine Name-revelation, climaxes in the glorification of the Name, and results in keeping believers in that Name. Although GJohn is often regarded as laying the greatest stress on Christology, the balancing of Jesus and the Father's names suggests a more nuanced attempt by John to locate Jesus within a fundamentally *theological* framework. Dunn suggests that the primary debate in which John was engaged with his contemporaries was a debate about monotheism.³³ John's emphasis on the divine Name encourages us to regard GJohn perhaps more as a fusion of both *theo*-logy and Christology. As Venard puts it, John's Jesus is inscribed within divine parameters such that all his words and deeds could be regarded as a "journey within the [divine] Name."³⁴ John is defining Jesus in terms of the Jewish God just as much as he is redefining the Jewish God in terms of Jesus.

Avenues for Further Research

In the preceding discussion, space has permitted only a brief speculation on the possibility of blaspheming the divine Name as a socio-historical impetus behind John's attraction to the Name category. This suggestion might merit further investigation with the tools made available through various sociological approaches to texts.

In addition, at various points in this thesis, reference was made to interesting points of connection between GJohn and Revelation. Although the remit of this thesis was limited to GJohn, it would be worthwhile to explore in more detail the relationship between the divine Name concept in GJohn and in Revelation, as well as to try to account for the absence of the divine Name from the Johannine epistles (but note 3 John 7).

Finally, the approach taken in this thesis of isolating questions of *impetus* from *influence* may open up a new entry-point for the discussion of the reception and adaptation of texts and ideas—both in GJohn and more widely—in which discussions are often dominated by questions of influence, allusion, and intertextuality.

³³ Dunn, "Let John be John," 318.

³⁴ Olivier-Thomas Venard, "Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν (John 8:24f): De-nominating God in the Gospel," *RevBib* 116 (2009): 195.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BSac	<i>Biblioteca Sacra</i>
BT	<i>Bible Translator</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EBS	Encountering Biblical Studies
ECDSS	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
HBS	Herders biblische Studien
HThKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HZNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IKZ	<i>Internationale katholische Zeitschrift</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCTCRS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
JGRChJ	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJT	<i>Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>

LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	<i>Novum Testamentum</i> , Supplement series
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTSI	The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel
<i>NTT</i>	<i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des Études Grecques</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SHCT	Studies in the History of Christian Traditions
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to numen)
SHS	Scripture and Hermeneutics Series
SJ	Studia Judaica
SNAM	Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern
SNTSMS	Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World
SPHS	Scholars Press Homage Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TynBull</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WB	Die Welt der Bibel
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
YJS	Yale Judaica Series
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

a) Jewish and Related Texts

The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2d Ed. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

1 Enoch: A New Translation. Translated by George Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.

The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes. Translated by Bruce Chilton. The Aramaic Bible 11. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael. 2 Vols. Translated by Jacob Lauterbach. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933.

Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah. Edited by John MacDonald. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1963.

Midrash Rabbah. 10 Vols. Edited by Rabbi H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1939.

The Odes of Solomon. Translated by James H. Charlesworth. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. 2 Vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures. Vol. 1. Edited by Richard Bauckham, James Davila, and Alexander Panayotov. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.

Philo. 10 Vols. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. LCL. London: William Heinemann, 1929-1962.

Pesahim. Translated by Rabbi Freedman. London: Soncino Press, 1967.

b) Early Christian and Related Texts

The Apostolic Fathers. 3rd Ed. Translated by Michael Holmes. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation. Edited by Hans Dieter Betz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri. 2 Vols. Karl Preisendanz. Leipzig: Verlag und Druck von B. G. Teubner, 1928-1931.

Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation, with Notes and Introduction. By Brian P. Copenhaver. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon, édition critique. Vol. 1. Philippe Bobichon. Fribourg: Academic Press Pribourg, 2003.

The Nag Hammadi Library in English. 3rd Ed. Edited by James Robinson. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

The Odes of Solomon. Translated by James H. Charlesworth. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

c) Pagan Texts

Pliny the Younger. 2 Vols. Translated by Betty Radice. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Seneca: Moral Essays. 3 Vols. Translated by John Basore. LCL. London: William Heinemann, 1928-1935.

Suetonius: Lives of the Caesars. 2 Vols. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. LCL. Repr. London: William Heinemann, 1920.

John Commentaries

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text.* 2d Ed. London: SPCK, 1978.

Beasley-Murray, George R. *John.* WBC 36. Accordance/Thomas Nelson electronic ed. Waco: Word Books, 1987.

Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John.* 2 Vols. Edited by A. H. McNeile. ICC. New York: Scribners, 1929.

Blank, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes.* Geistliche Schriftlesung. Vol. 1b. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1981.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John I-XII: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 29. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

- _____. *The Gospel According to John XIII–XXI: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 29A. Edited by W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. NTD 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Carson, Don A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Hoskyns, Sir Edwyn C. *The Fourth Gospel*. 2 Vols. Edited by Francis N. Davey. London: Faber and Faber, 1940.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 Vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to St. John*. BNTC. Edited by Morna D. Hooker. New York: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. NCBC. Edited by Matthew Black. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Moody Smith, Jr., Dwight. *John*. ANTC. Edited by Victor Paul Furnish. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1999.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John: The English Text, with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. NICNT. Edited by F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 Vols. Translated by Kevin Smith, Cecily Hastings, Francis McDonagh, Richard Foley, David Smith, and G. A. Kon. HThKNT. New York: Herder & Herder, 1968-1982.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HZNT 6. Edited by Andreas Lindemann. Verlag: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel According to St. John*. London: John Murray, 1903.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

Secondary Sources

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6. WUNT 2:78*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- _____. *The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.
- Appold, Mark L. *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John. WUNT 2:1*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1976.
- Ashton, John. *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- _____. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. 2d Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Asiedu-Peprah, Martin. *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts as Juridical Controversy. WUNT 2:132*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Attridge, Harold. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hermeneia 72*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Augenstein, Jörg. *Das Liebesgebot im Johannesevangelium und in den Johannesbriefen. BWANT 134*. Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1994.
- Aune, David E. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. NovTSup 28*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Ball, David Mark. *"I Am" in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications. JSNTSup 124*. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Baron, Lori. "Reinterpreting the Shema: The Battle over the Unity of God in the Fourth Gospel." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Boston, MA, November 2008.
- _____. "The Shema in John's Gospel Against Its Backgrounds in Second Temple Judaism." Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University, 2015.
- Barrett, C. K. "Christocentric or Theocentric? Observations on the Theological Method of the Fourth Gospel." In *Essays on John*, 1-18. London: SPCK, 1982.
- _____. "The Father Is Greater Than I' (John 14.28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament." In *Essays on John*, 19-36. London: SPCK, 1982.
- _____. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *JTS* 38 (1947): 155-169.

- Barton, Stephen C. "The Unity of Humankind as a Theme in Biblical Theology." In *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Craig Bartholomew, Mary Healy, Karl Möller, and Robin Perry, 233-260. SHS 5. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Divine and Human Community." In *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*, 21-42. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015.
- _____. "God Crucified." In *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*, 1-59. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- _____. "John for Readers of Mark." In *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, 147-171. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. "Monotheism and Christology in the Gospel of John." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 239-252. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- _____. "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity." In *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*, 182-232. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- _____. "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel." In *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*, 113-136. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- _____. "The Divinity of Jesus in the Letter to the Hebrews." In *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*, 233-253. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- _____. *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. New Testament Theology. Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation*. NIGTC 21. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____. "The Old Testament Background of Rev 3.14." *NTS* 42 (1996): 133-152.
- Beale, G. K. and Sean M. McDonough. "Revelation." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 1081-1161. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Beutler, Johannes. "Das Hauptgebot im Johannesevangelium." In *Das Gesetz im neuen Testament*. Edited by Karl Kertelge, 222-236. Freiburg: Herder, 1986.
- _____. "Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12.20f)." *Biblica* 71 (1990): 333-347.
- _____. *Martyria: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Zeugnisthema bei Johannes*. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1972.

- Beutler, Johannes and Robert T. Fortna, eds. *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context*. SNTSMS 67. Edited by Graham Stanton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Bietenhard, Hans. "Name" in *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 2. Edited by Colin Brown, 648-655. Grand Rapids, MI: Paternoster Press, 1986.
- _____. "Ὄνομα" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. V (Ε-Πα). Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 242-283. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Blank, Josef. *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie*. Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bock, Darrell and James H. Charlesworth, eds. *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. JCTCRS 11. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: T&T Clark, 2013.
- Bonney, William. *Caused to Believe: The Doubting Thomas Story at the Climax of John's Christological Narrative*. BibInt 62. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Rolf Rendtorff. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. NovTSup 10. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- _____. "God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, 137-148. SHR 14. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- _____. "John 6: Tradition, Interpretation and Composition." In *Critical Readings of John 6*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper, 95-114. BibInt 22. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Rolf Rendtorff. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Bovon, François. "Names and Numbers in Early Christianity." *NTS* 47 (2001): 267-288.
- Boyarín, Daniel. "The Gospel of the *Memra*: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John." *HTR* 94 (2001): 243-284.
- Bratcher, Robert G. "'The Name' in Prepositional Phrases in the New Testament." *BT* 14 (1963): 72-80.
- Brockington, L. H. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in Δόξα." *VT* 1 (1951): 23-32.

- Brooke, George J. "Isaiah in the Pesharim and other Qumran Texts." In *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by C. C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, 609-632. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, 35-38. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Brown, Raymond. E. "Incidents That Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John." *CBQ* 23 (1961): 143-160.
- Brunson, Andrew C. *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John*. WUNT 2:158. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Bühner, Jan A. *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium: Die Kultur und religionsgeschichtlichen Grundlagen der johanneischen Sendungschristologie sowie ihre traditionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung*. WUNT 2:2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 Vols. New York: Scribners, 1955.
- Burkitt, F. C. "The Hebrew Papyrus of the Ten Commandments." *JQR* 15 (1903): 392-408.
- Byers, Andrew J. "Johannine Theosis: The Fourth Gospel's Narrative Ecclesiology of Participation and Deification." Ph.D. Thesis, Durham University, 2014.
- Caird, G. B. "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics." *NTS* 15 (1969): 265-277.
- _____. *The Revelation of St. John*. BNTC 19. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Capes, David B. "YHWH Texts and Monotheism in Paul's Christology." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North, 120-137. JSNTSup 263. Edited by Mark Goodacre. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Did the Fourth Evangelist Know the Enoch Tradition?" In *Testimony and Interpretation: Early Christology in its Judeo-Hellenistic Milieu. Studies in Honour of Petr Pokorný*. Edited by Jiří Mrázek and Jan Roskovec, 223-239. JSNTSup 272. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Chester, Andrew. *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim*. TSAJ 14. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- _____. *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology*. WUNT 207. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Chibici-Revneanu, Nicole. *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: Das Verständnis der Doxa im Johannesevangelium*. WUNT 2:231. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

- _____. "Variations on Glorification: John 13,31f. And Johannine Doxa-Language." In *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz, 511-522. BETL 223. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Chilton, Bruce. "John 12.34 and Targum Isaiah 52.13." *NovT* 22 (1980): 176-178.
- Clark-Soles, Jamie. *Scripture Cannot be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Cohon, Samuel S. "The Name of God: A Study in Rabbinic Theology." *HUCA* 23 (1950): 579-604.
- Collins, John J. "The Background of the 'Son of God' Text." *BBR* 7 (1997): 51-62.
- Collins, Raymond F. " 'You Call me Teacher and Lord - and You are Right. For That is What I Am' (John 13.13)." In *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology. Festschrift Gilbert van Belle*. Edited by Geert van Oyen, Joseph Verheyden, Michael Labahn, and Reimund Bieringer, 327-348. BETL 265. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Cook, Edward M. "4Q246." *BBR* 5 (1995): 43-66.
- Cook, W. R. "The Glory Motif in the Johannine Corpus." *JETS* 27 (1984): 291-297.
- Dahl, Nils A. "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology." In *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Edited by Donald H. Juel, 153-163. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Dahl, Nils A. and Alan F. Segal. "Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God." *JSJ* 9 (1978): 1-28.
- Daise, Michael A. "Quotations with 'Remembrance' Formulae in the Fourth Gospel." In *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Alicia Myers and Bruce Schuchard, 75-91. RBS 81. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Atlanta: SBL, 2015.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Translated by J. A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964.
- Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone, 1956.
- Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 69. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Davila, James. *Liturgical Works*. ECDSS 6. Edited by Martin Abegg Jr. and Peter Flint. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

- Davis, Carl Judson. *The Name and Way of the Lord: Old Testament Themes, New Testament Christology*. JSNTSup 129. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic press, 1996.
- de la Potterie, Ignace. "Χάρις paulinienne et Χάρις johannique." In *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by E. Ellis and E. Grässer, 256-282. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Dietzfelbinger, Christian. *Der Abschied des Kommenden: Eine Auslegung der johanneischen Abschiedsreden*. WUNT 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Dodd, C. H. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- _____. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Dunn, J. D. G. "Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher, 293-322. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Ehring, Christina. "YHWH's Return in Isaiah 40.1-11* and 52.7-10: Pre-exilic Cultic Traditions of Jerusalem and Babylonian Influence." In *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second Temple Judah*. Edited by Ehud ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, 91-104. FAT 85. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Ekblad, Eugene Robert, Jr. *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. CBET 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC 19. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Ely, Mary Redington. *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought*. New York: Macmillan, 1925.
- Evans, Craig A. "Obduracy and the Lord's Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by William F. Stinespring and Craig A. Evans, 221-36. SPSHS 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- _____. "The Voice from Heaven: A Note on John 12.28." *CBQ* 43 (1981): 405-408.
- _____. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. JSNTSup 64. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- _____. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. JSNTS 89. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Evans, Craig A., Robert L. Webb and Richard A. Wiebe, eds. *Nag Hammadi Texts and the Bible: A Synopsis and Index*. NTTS 18. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

- Ferda, Tucker S. "Naming the Messiah: A Contribution to the 4Q246 'Son of God' Debate." *DSD* 21 (2014): 150-175.
- Feuillet, A. "Les Ego Eimi Christologiques du Quatrième Evangile: La Révélation Énigmatique de l'être Divine de Jésus dans Jean et les Synoptiques." *RSR* 54 (1966): 5-22.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "Some Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity Texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 7 (2000): 292-312.
- Ford, J. " 'He that Cometh' and the Divine Name (Apocalypse 1.4, 8; 4.8)." *JSJ* 1 (1970): 144-147.
- Fossum, Jarl E. "In the Beginning Was the Name: Onomanology as the Key to Johannine Christology." In *The Image of the Invisible God: The Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*, 117-133. NTOA 30. Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- _____. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- Foster, Paul. "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament." *JSNT* 38 (2015): 96-111.
- _____. "Why Did Matthew Get the Shema Wrong? A Study of Matthew 22.37." *JBL* 122 (2003): 309-333.
- Freed, Edwin D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. NovTSup 11. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Frey, Jörg. " '...Das sie meine Herrlichkeit schauen (Joh 17.24):' Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der δοξα Jesu." *NTS* 54 (2008): 375-397.
- _____. *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. 3 Vols. WUNT 96, 110, 117. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997-2000.
- _____. "Eschatology in the Johannine Circle." In *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz, 47-82. BETL 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- _____. "Heiden - Griechen - Gotteskinder: Zu Gestalt und Funktion der Rede von den Heiden im 4. Evangelium." In *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*. Edited by Reinhard Feldmeier and Ulrich Heckel, 228-268. WUNT 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- _____. "Love-Relations in the Fourth Gospel: Establishing a Semantic Network." In *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*. Edited by Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz, 171-198. BETL 223. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Fuller, Reginal H. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. New York: Scribners, 1965.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Shema in the New Testament: Deut 6.4-5 in Significant Passages*. Lund: Novapress, 1996.

Gianotti, Charles. "The Meaning of the Divine Name YHWH." *BSac* 142 (1985): 38-51.

Giesbrecht, Friedrich. *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage*. Königsberg: Thomas & Oppermann, 1901.

Gieschen, Charles. A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. AGJU 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

_____. "The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology." *VC* 57 (2003): 115-158.

_____. "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by G. Boccaccini, 238-249. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.

Goldingay, John. *Isaiah 56-66*, ICC. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.

Goldingay, John and David Payne. *Isaiah 40-55*. 2 Vols. ICC. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Gordon, R. P. "Inscribed Pots and Zechariah XIV 20-21." *VT* 42 (1992): 120-123.

Grether, Oskar. *Name und Wort Gottes im alten Testament*. BZAW 64. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1934.

Grillmeier, Aloys. *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*. Vol. 1 of *Christ in Christian Tradition*. 2d Rev. ed. Translated by John Bowden. Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975.

Grözinger, Karl. "The Names of God and the Celestial Powers: Their Function and Meaning in the Hekhalot Literature." *JSJT* 6 (1987): 53-69.

Hägerland, Tobias. "John's Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?" *JSNT* 25 (2003): 309-322.

Hakola, Raimo. *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*. NovTSup 118. Edited by M. M. Mitchell and D. P. Moessner. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Hamid-Khani, Saeed. *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 2:120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Hamilton Jr., James M. "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John." *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 139-162.

Hannah, Darrell D. "Isaiah's Vision in the Ascension of Isaiah and the Early Church." *JTS* 50 (1999): 80-101.

_____. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2:109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

- Hanson, Anthony T. *Grace and Truth: A Study in the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- _____. "John 1.14-18 and Exodus 34." *NTS* 23 (1976): 90-101.
- _____. "John's Use of Scripture." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. JSNTSup 104. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, 358-379. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Harner, Philip B. *The "I Am" of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Hartman, Lars. *Into the Name of the Lord Jesus: Baptism in the Early Church*. SNTW. Edited by John Barclay, Joel Marcus, and John Riches. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Harvey, Anthony E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Hayward, C. T. R. *Divine Name and Presence: The Memra*. Totowa: Allanheld, Osmun and Co., 1981.
- _____. "The Holy Name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St. John's Gospel." *NTS* 25 (1978): 16-32.
- Heinemann, Joseph. *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*. SJ 9. Edited by E. L. Ehrlich. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. *Im Namen Jesu: Eine sprach-und religionsgeschichtlich Untersuchung zum neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristliche Taufe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Hengel, Martin. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. JSNTSup 104. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, 380-395. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1976.
- Hera, Marianus Pale. *Christology and Discipleship in John 17*. WUNT 2:342. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hinrichs, Boy. *"Ich Bin": Die Konsistenz des Johannes-Evangeliums in der Konzentration auf das Wort Jesus*. SBS 133. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988.
- Hooker, Morna D. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1959.

- _____. "The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret." *NTS* 21 (1974): 40-58.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59. Edited by F. G. Martinez. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Humphrey, Edith M. *Joseph and Aseneth*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Jesus' as God's Name, and Jesus as God's embodied Name in Justin Martyr." In *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster, 128-136. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- _____. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- _____. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Instone-Brewer, David. *Prayer and Agriculture*. Vol. 1 of *Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Jacob, Benno. *Im Namen Gottes: Eine sprachliche und religionsgeschichtlich Untersuchung zum alten und neuen Testament*. Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian. *Christologie und Eschatologie: Joh 5,17-30 als Schlüsseltext johanneischer Theologie*. WUNT 126. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Kanagaraj, Jey J. 'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John. JSNTSup 158. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Keiser, Thomas. "The Song of Moses a Basis for Isaiah's Prophecy." *VT* 55 (2005): 486-500.
- Kennedy, George A. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: the Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSup 220. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Kirchhevel, Gordon D. "The Children of God and the Glory That John 1:14 Saw." *BBR* 6 (1996): 87-93.
- Klink III, Edward W. *Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*. SNTSMS 141. Edited by John Court. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *Encountering John: The Gospel in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*. EBS. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1999.

- _____. "John." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 415-512. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- _____. *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and Mission of the Contemporary Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Labahn, Michael. "Deuteronomy in John's Gospel." In *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, 82-98. LNTS 358. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Larsson, Tord. *God in the Fourth Gospel: A Hermeneutical Study of the History of Interpretations*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.
- Lattke, Michael. *Odes of Solomon: A Commentary*. Translated by Marianne Ehrhardt. Hermeneia 86. Edited by Harold Attridge. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Lee, Dorothy A. "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20." *JSNT* 58 (1995): 37-49.
- Lieu, Judith M. *I, II, and III John: A Commentary*. NTL. London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- _____. "How John Writes." In *The Written Gospel*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and D. A. Hagner, 171-183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Lincicum, David. "The Origin of 'Alpha and Omega' (Revelation 1.8; 21.6; 22.13): A Suggestion." *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 128-133.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Accordance/Thomas Nelson electronic Ed. Waco: Word Books, 1990.
- _____. "God's Name, Jesus' Name, and Prayer in the Fourth Gospel." In *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard Longenecker, 155-180. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- _____. "Trials, Plots and the Narrative of the Fourth Gospel." *JSNT* 56 (1994): 3-30.
- _____. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Loader, William R. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Longenecker, Richard. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.
- _____. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London: SCM, 1970.
- MacDonald, John. *The Theology of the Samaritans*. London: SCM Press, 1964.

- Malatesta, Edward. *Interiority and Covenant: A Study of Εἶναι Ἐν and Μένειν Ἐν in the First Letter of Saint John*. Anbib 69. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Martin, Ralph P. *Carmen Christi: Philippians 2.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. SNTSMS 4. Edited by Matthew Black. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Martínez, Florentino García, "The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246." In *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic texts from Qumran*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, 162-179. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- McDonough, Sean M. *YHWH at Patmos: Rev 1.4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting*. WUNT 2: 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- McGrath, James. *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology*. SNTSMS 111. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. JSJSup 115. Edited by John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*. 2d Ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum*. AnBib 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- McPolin, James. "The 'Name' of the Father and of the Son in the Johannine Writings: An Exegetical Study of the Johannine Texts on *Onoma* with Reference to the Father and the Son." Ph.D. Thesis, Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1972.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *JBL* 91 (1972): 44-72.
- _____. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. NovTSup 14. Edited by W. C. van Unnik. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. JSNTSup 84. Edited by Martinus C. de Boer, 292-320. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- _____. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. CBET 15. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Merlier, Octave. "'Onoma' et 'en Onomati' dans le Quatrième Évangile." *REG* 47 (1934): 180-204.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982.

- Metzenthin, Christian. *Jesaja-Auslegung in Qumran*. ATANT 98. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2010.
- Meyer, Paul W. "The Father: The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel." In *Exploring the Gospel of John: Essays in Honour of D. Moody-Smith*. Edited by Clifton C. Black and R. A. Culpepper, 255-273. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Mihalios, Stefanos. *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature*. LNTS 436. Edited by Mark Goodacre. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Moloney, Francis J. "Telling God's Story: The Fourth Gospel." In *Forgotten God: Perspectives in Biblical Theology*. Edited by A. Andrew Das and Frank J. Matera, 107-122. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- _____. "The Function of Prolepsis in the Interpretation of John 6." In *Critical Readings of John 6*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper, 129-148. BibInt 22. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Rolf Rendtorff. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. "To Make God Known: A Reading of John 17.1-26." *Salesianum* 59 (1997): 463-489.
- Moody Smith, Dwight. *John Among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth Century Research*. 2d Ed. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2001.
- Murray-Jones, Christopher R. A. "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition." *JJS* 43 (1992): 1-31.
- Murray-Jones, Christopher R. A. and Christopher Rowland. *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Pieter Willem van der Horst and Peter J. Tomson. CRINT 12. Edited by Peter J. Tomson. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Morris, Leon. *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Mortley, Raoul. "The Name of the Father is the Son' (Gospel of Truth 38)." In *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*. Edited by Richard T. Wallis and Jay Bregman, 239-252. SNAM 6. Edited by R. Baine Harris. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Motyer, Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2d Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Myers, Alicia D. *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*. LNTS 458. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- New, Silva. "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands." In *The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, 121-139. Part 1. Vol. 5 of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan & Co., 1933.

Neyrey, Jerome. " 'Equal to God,' (John 5.18)." In *The Gospel in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective*, 172-190. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

_____. " 'My Lord and My God': The Heavenly Character of Jesus in John's Gospel." In *The Gospel of John in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective*, 441-453. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

Nickelsburg, George, and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82*. Hermeneia. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Nielsen, Jesper T. "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 56 (2010): 343-366.

Niles, Daniel Prem. *The Name of God in Israel's Worship: The Theological Importance of the Name Yahweh*. Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1975.

North, Wendy S. "Monotheism and the Gospel of John: Jesus, Moses and the Law." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North, 155-166. JSNTSup 263. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

_____. "The Anointing in John 12.1-8: A Tale of Two Hypotheses." In *Engaging with C. H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Catrin H. Williams, 216-230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

_____. *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition*. JSNTSup 212. Edited by Stanley Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Obermann, Andreas. *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate*. WUNT 2:83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

O'Day, Gail R. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Okure, Teresa. *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4.1-42*. WUNT 2:31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.

Orlov, Andrei. "Praxis of the Voice: The Divine Name Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*." *JBL* 127 (2008): 53-70.

Painter, John. "Tradition, History, and Interpretation in John 10." In *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*. Edited by Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna, 53-74. SNTSMS 67. Edited by Graham Stanton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Pamment, Margaret. "The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel." *ZNW* 74 (1983): 12-16.

_____. "The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel." *JTS* 36 (1985): 56-66.

- Pancaro, Severino. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity, According to John*. NovTSup 42. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Parkinson, William Q. "In the Name of Jesus: The Ritual Use and Christological Significance of the Name of Jesus in Early Christianity." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2003.
- Park-Taylor, G. H. *Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.
- Parsenios, George L. *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif*. WUNT 258. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Peeler, Amy L. B. *You Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. LNTS 486. Edited by Mark Goodacre. London: T&T Clark, 2014.
- Peerbolte, Bert-Jan Lietaert. "The Name above all Names (Philippians 2.9)." In *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*. Edited by George H. van Kooten, 187-206. TBN 9. Edited by George H. van Kooten, Robert A. Kuglar, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Peppard, Michael. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Philonenko, Marc. *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfilment Motif and the Passover Theme." In *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. JSNTSup 104. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, 396-428. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Purvis, James D. "The Fourth Gospel and the Samaritans." In *The Composition of John's Gospel: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, 148-185. Compiled by David E. Horton. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Quispel, Gilles. "Het Johannesevangelie en de Gnosis." *NTT* 2 (1957): 173-203.
- _____. "Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity." In *John and Qumran*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, 137-155. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972.
- Reim, Gunther. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*. SNTSMS 22. Edited by Matthew Black. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Reynolds, Benjamin E. *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. WUNT 2:249. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Richardson, Neil. *God in the New Testament*. Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1999.

- Richey, Lance Byron. *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John*. CBQMS 43. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007.
- Richter, J. "Ani Hu und Ego Eimi." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Erlangen, 1956.
- Richter, Sandra L. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology: Lešakkēn Šemô Šām in the Bible*. BZAW 318. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Ronning, John L. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
 _____. "The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature." *WTJ* 69 (2007): 247-278.
- Rose, H. J. "Divine Names in Classical Greece." *HTR* 51 (1958): 3-32.
- Rose, Martin. "Names of God in the OT." Edited by David Noel Freedman, 1001-1011. *ABD* 4. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Rösel, Martin. "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch." *JSOT* 31 (2007): 411-428.
- Rouiller, Von Grégoire. "Leben in seinem Namen: Der Evangelist Johannes und seine Theologie des Namens." *IKZ* 22 (1993): 54-62.
- Roukema, Riemer. "Jesus and the Divine Name in the Gospel of John." In *Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*. Edited by George H. van Kooten, 207-224. TBN 9. Edited by George H. van Kooten, Robert A. Kuglar, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Ruck-Schröder, Adelheid. *Der Name Gottes und der Name Jesu: Eine neutestamentliche Studie*. WMANT 80. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1999.
- Sabbe, M. "John 10 and Its Relation to the Synoptic Gospels." In *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context*. Edited by Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna, 75-93. SNTSMS 67. Edited by Graham Stanton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Sadananda, Daniel R. *The Johannine Exegesis of God: An Exploration into the Johannine Understanding of God*. BZNW 121. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Sawyer, John. *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Schäfer, Peter. *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

- Schenk, Wolfgang. "Die Um-Codierungen der matthäischen Unser-Vater-Redaktion in Joh 17." In *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux, 587-607. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt*. Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1930.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. "Strukturanalyse von Joh 17." *BZ* 17 (1973): 67-78, 196-202.
- Scholem, Gershom. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*. 2d Ed. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965.
- _____. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. 3d Ed. New York: Schocken, 1954.
- Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. SBLDS 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Schwindt, Rainer. *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*. HBS 50. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- Scrutton, Anastasia. " 'The Truth will set you Free': Salvation as Revelation." In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 359-368. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Segal, Alan F. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*. Repr. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Segovia, Fernando F. *Love Relationships in the Johannine Tradition: Agape/Agapan in 1 John and the Fourth Gospel*. SBLDS 58. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Seifrid, Mark A. "Romans." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, 607-694. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Seitz, Christopher R. "The Call of Moses and the 'Revelation' of the Divine Name." In *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness*. Edited by Christopher R. Seitz, 229-250. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Shirbourn, G. F. "The Giving of the Name of God to Jesus in John 17.11, 12." Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Söding, Thomas. "'Ich und der Vater sind Eins' (Joh 10, 30). Die johanneische Christologie vor dem Anspruch des Hauptgebotes (Dtn 6,4f.)." *ZNW* 93 (2002): 177-199.
- Stevick, Daniel B. *Jesus and His Own: A Commentary on John 13-17*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

- Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. SNTSMS 73. Edited by Graham Stanton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Stube, John C. *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse*. LNTS 309. Edited by Mark Goodacre. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "'Angels' and 'God': Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North, 45-70. JSNTSup 263. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- _____. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2:70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- _____. "Protect Them from the Evil One (John 17.15): Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Mary Coloe and Tom Thatcher, 139-160. EJL 32. Edited by Judith Newman. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts." In *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, 147-162. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Tan, Kim Huat. "The Shema and Early Christianity." *TynBull* 59 (2008): 181-206.
- Thatcher, Tom. "Why John Wrote a Gospel: Memory and History in an Early Christian Community." In *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher, 79-97. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2005.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. "'God's Voice You Have Never Heard, God's Form You Have Never Seen': The Characterization of God in the Gospel of John." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 177-204.
- _____. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- _____. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.
- Thüsing, Wilhelm. *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*. NTAbh 21. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.
- _____. *Herrlichkeit und Einheit: Eine Auslegung des hohepriesterlichen Gebetes Jesu (Johannes 17)*. WB 14. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1962.
- Tolmie, D. Francois. "The Characterization of God in the Fourth Gospel." *JSNT* 69 (1998): 57-75.
- Truex, Jerry Duane. "The Problem of Blasphemy: The Fourth Gospel and Early Jewish Understandings." Ph.D. Thesis, Durham, 2001.
- Tsouterov, Alexandr. "Glory, Grace, and Truth in the Gospel of John 1.14-18." Ph.D. Thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2005.

- Turner, John D. "The History of Religions Background of John 10." In *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar*. Edited by Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna, 33-52. SNTSMS 67. Edited by Graham Stanton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Untergassmair, Franz G. *Im Namen Jesu Beten*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1990.
- _____. *Im Namen Jesu, der Namensbegriff im Johannesevangelium: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den johanneischen Namensaussagen*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.
- Van Belle, Gilbert. "Repetitions and Variations in Johannine Research: A General Historical Survey." In *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*. Edited by Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz, 33-86. BETL 223. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- _____. "Theory of Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: A Neglected Field of Research?" In *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*. Edited by Jan van der Watt, G. van Belle, and P. Maritz, 13-32. BETL 223. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Van den Berg, Robbert M., "Does it Matter to Call God Zeus? Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 24-25 against the Greek Intellectual on Divine Names." In *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*. Edited by George H. van Kooten, 169-183. TBN 9. Edited by George H. van Kooten, Robert A. Kuglar, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Van der Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. SCS 61. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Van Kooten, George. H. "Moses/Musaeus/Mochos and His God Yahweh/Iao, and Sabaoth, Seen from Graeco-Roman Perspective." In *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*. Edited by George van Kooten, 107-138. TBN 9. Edited by George H. van Kooten, Robert A. Kuglar, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Vollenweider, Samuel. "‘Der Name, der über jedem anderen Namen ist’: Jesus als Träger des Gottesnamens im neuen Testament." In *Gott Nennen: Gottes Namen und Gott als Name*. Edited by Ingolf Dalferth and Philipp Stoellger, 173-188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. 2 Vols. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.
- Van Tilborg, Sjef. *Reading John in Ephesus*. NovTSup 83. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Venard, Olivier-Thomas. "Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν (John 8:24f): De-nominating God in the Gospel." *RB* 116 (2009): 184-198.

- Von Wahlde, Urban. "Judas, the Son of Perdition, and the Fulfillment of Scripture in John 17.12." In *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context. Studies in Honour of David E. Aune*. Edited by John Fotopoulos, 167-182. NovTSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Waddell, James A. *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios*. JTCRS 10. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Walker, William O. "The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in John." *NTS* 28 (1982): 237-256.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34-66*. WBC 25. Accordance/Thomas Nelson electronic Ed. Waco, TX: Word Books, 2005.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66*. OTL. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Whitacre, Rodney A. *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology*. SBLDS 67. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Wilkinson, Robert J., *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God: From the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*. SHCT 179. Edited by Robert J. Bast. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Williams, Catrin H. " 'He Saw His Glory and Spoke About Him': The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology." In *Honouring the Past and Shaping the Future: Religious and Biblical Studies in Wales: Essays in Honour of Gareth Lloyd Jones*. Edited by Robert Pope, 53-80. Leominster, Herefordshire: Antony Rowe, 2003.
- _____. *I Am He: The Interpretation of 'Anî Hû' in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. WUNT 2:113. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- _____. " 'I Am' or 'I Am He'? : Self-Declaratory Pronouncements in the Fourth Gospel and Rabbinic Tradition." In *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher, 343-352. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- _____. "Isaiah in John's Gospel." In *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, 101-117. NTSI. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- _____. "John and the Rabbis Revisited." In *Engaging with C. H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Catrin H. Williams, 107-125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- _____. "Patriarchs and Prophets Remembered: Framing Israel's Past in the Gospel of John." In *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard, 187-212. RBS 81. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.

- _____. "‘Seeing the Glory’: The Reception of Isaiah’s Call-Vision in John 12.41." In *Judaism, Jewish Identities and the Gospel Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maurice Casey*. Edited by James G. Crossley, 187-206. London: Equinox Press, 2010.
- _____. "The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology." In *As Those Who are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire Mathew McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, 107-124. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.
- _____. "Unveiling Revelation: The Spirit-Paraclete and Apocalyptic Disclosure in the Gospel of John." In *John’s Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*. Edited by Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland, 104-127. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Wolfson, Elliot R. "Circumcision and the Divine Name: A Study in the Transmission of Esoteric Doctrine." *JQR* 78 (1987): 77-112.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 Vols. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Yoder, Perry B., ed. *Take This Word to Heart: The Shema in Torah and Gospel*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 2005.
- Young, Franklin W. "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel." *ZNW* 46 (1955): 215-233.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Zimmermann, Christiane. *Die Namen des Vaters: Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen vor ihrem frühjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont*. AJEC 69. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Zimmermann, H. "Das absolute 'Ego Eimi' als die neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformel." *BZ* 4 (1960): 54-69.
- Zimmermann, Ruben. "Imagery in John: Opening up Paths into the Tangled Thicket of John’s Figurative World." In *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann, 1-43. WUNT 200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.